

THE COLLABORATIVE-CONSULTATIVE
RESOURCE TEACHER PROGRAM:
FACTORS AFFECTING ITS IMPLEMENTATION
IN THE JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL

A Thesis
Presented to
The Faculty of Graduate Studies
The University of Manitoba

In Partial Fulfillment
of the requirements for the Degree
Master of Education

by

Donna L. Miller
March, 1990



National Library
of Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Canadian Theses Service Service des thèses canadiennes

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

The author has granted an irrevocable non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of his/her thesis by any means and in any form or format; making this thesis available to interested persons.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in his/her thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her permission.

L'auteur a accordé une licence irrévocable et non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de sa thèse de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit pour mettre des exemplaires de cette thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège sa thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

ISBN 0-315-63388-3

Canada

THE COLLABORATIVE-CONSULTATIVE RESOURCE TEACHER
PROGRAM:
FACTORS AFFECTING ITS IMPLEMENTATION IN THE JUNIOR
HIGH SCHOOL

BY

DONNA L. MILLER

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies of
the University of Manitoba in partial fulfillment of the requirements
of the degree of

MASTER OF EDUCATION

© 1990

Permission has been granted to the LIBRARY OF THE UNIVER-
SITY OF MANITOBA to lend or sell copies of this thesis, to
the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this
thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film, and UNIVERSITY
MICROFILMS to publish an abstract of this thesis.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the
thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or other-
wise reproduced without the author's written permission.

ABSTRACT

Although the use of the consultative resource teacher model has been the practice of the Provincial Department of Education for two decades, its implementation has been difficult. This exploratory study attempted to provide some insight into the many reasons for this difficulty.

The study is descriptive. Resource teachers and principals in five suburban junior high schools, within a school division that has had a divisional policy on a collaborative-consultative resource teacher service for nine years, were interviewed. Questionnaires were distributed to classroom teachers in these schools but the rate of return was very low. The data from these questionnaires and interviews were compiled into case studies.

Because of a low rate of response to the questionnaires, I do not claim that this study is a true picture of the consultative resource teacher program in that school division. The true state is unknown. I believe that I have made the best and most appropriate use of the data.

The case studies suggest that each school had adapted the resource role to fit its unique environment. Even though the divisional policy stated that a collaborative-consultative role was to be used by the resource teachers, every school had a tutorial program. Some schools differentiated this program from the regular resource program and it functioned alongside a modified consultative approach. In other schools, the resource program encompassed the tutorial program and it was difficult to determine the degree to which consultation and its resulting program modification actually occurred.

This study shows that system and organizational conditions must be considered when implementing a new program that involves change in roles and curriculum. The addition of a collaborative-consultative resource teacher to a school involves a major change in the structure of the school. When the structure is not changed, the new program is likely to be adapted to be congruent with the existing structure.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Sincere appreciation is expressed for the constructive direction and advice given by Anthony Riffel, Jon Young and Gerald Bravi who served as advisors for this thesis. Special thanks are given to Anthony Riffel whose encouragement led me to pursue this topic of study and to continue to develop this idea into a finished piece of work.

Secondly, I wish to thank the administration and the resource and classroom teachers who provided the opportunity to develop the questionnaires and interview schedules as well as to conduct the interviews and distribute the questionnaires. The cooperation and support shown by the personnel of the school division is greatly appreciated.

Lastly, I wish to thank my family for their continued support and encouragement. Without the support and assistance of my husband and the patience and understanding of my children, this project would never have reached completion.

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iii
CONTENTS	iv
LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS AND TABLES	vi
 CHAPTER ONE OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY	
History and Background	1
A Personal Perspective on the Problem of Change.....	4
The Purpose.....	6
Design and Procedures.....	6
Analysis of Data	8
 CHAPTER TWO REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	
The Evolution of a Consultative Approach to Resource Teacher Service	10
Effectiveness of the Resource Teacher Consultant Approach	11
Models of Consultation.....	12
Factors Related to Implementation of Consultation.....	13
Summary.....	20
 CHAPTER THREE A REVIEW OF THE STUDY FINDINGS	
A Review of the Study Findings	22
Divisional Policies.....	22
Case Study One: Commason Junior High.....	26

Case Study Two: Dr. Darrell Junior High	36
Case Study Three: Anacreon Junior High.....	41
Case Study Four: Bayata Junior High.....	50
Case Study Five: Esbak Junior High	60
Divisional Trends.....	67

CHAPTER FOUR DISCUSSION

Discussion.....	71
School System.....	71
School Climate.....	73
Organization.....	76
Administrator	81
Teachers	86
Resource Teacher.....	89
Conclusion	93
Suggestions for Further Research	100

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

The Resource Model.....	103
-------------------------	-----

APPENDIX B

The Interview Schedules.....	110
------------------------------	-----

APPENDIX C

The Questionnaire.....	120
------------------------	-----

APPENDIX D

The Panel.....	138
----------------	-----

APPENDIX E

The Letters.....	141
------------------	-----

APPENDIX F

Glossary.....	147
---------------	-----

BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	154
-------------------	-----

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS AND TABLES

TABLE ONE

EFFECTS OF INTEGRATION79

CHAPTER ONE

OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY

This thesis is a report of a study of the collaborative-consultative resource teacher program at the junior high school level. The program reviewed was in a suburban school division that had a policy advocating its use for nine years. The purpose of the study was to (1) describe the current state of this collaborative-consultative resource teacher program and to (2) present information regarding some of the many variables which may affect the implementation of this type of resource program at the secondary level. By studying the factors which affect consultation, it is hoped that a deeper understanding of the complexity of the resource teacher-consultant role and its relationship to the other professional roles in the school system will be achieved.

History and Background

Until 1970, provincial financial support for special education services was limited to grants for segregated special education classes (Stephan 1976). The emergence of the resource teacher role in the province in the 1970's is usually attributed to the political pressure of various parent groups as they sought better learning environments for their children. The Associations for Children with Learning Disabilities were leaders in this regard. They demanded financial support for educational services for children with learning disabilities and advocated a school organization where children with average to above average abilities who were not successful in their learning would receive in-school and in-class assistance (Chale 1979). The Department of Education advocated the adoption of a supportive program which would enable children with learning problems to remain with their peers most of the time and receive short term assistance from a specialist teacher. This concept evolved into the role of the resource teacher (Stephan 1976).

Provincial Regulation 143/70 designated a resource teacher as a teacher whose principal duties were to diagnose individual problems, prescribe special remedial measures for use by teaching staff and provide consultative services to staff and parents. Regulation 79/71 amended 143/70 by adding "and provide direct assistance to students in need of special help." The goal of the program was to enable children with learning difficulties to receive assistance in terms of revised teaching

methodology and classroom arrangement so that they could progress without being removed from the "mainstream." Prescriptive teaching was to provide remediation of specific learning disabilities and prepare the child to cope with the demands of regular curricula. The responsibility for the total educational program was to remain with the classroom teacher. The resource teacher was to be seen as a helper and it was hoped that the resource teacher would develop into an inhouse consultant (Stephan 1976). The resource teacher role was visualized as one of diagnosis and program planning for children with "specific learning disabilities," for the purpose of enabling regular class teachers to appropriately accommodate the learning disabled in the mainstream (Cenerini 1980).

When the resource teacher was introduced to the provincial school system, the role was largely confined to elementary schools. The idea of learning disabled students was new and there were no guidelines to help establish school procedures, teacher work loads, operating budgets or the desired organizational structure (Chale 1979). Regional meetings were held with superintendents and principals to introduce and clarify the resource teacher concept, but Stephan suggests that the administrators were mainly interested in the financial aspects of the program and very few questions were raised about its implementation (Stephan 1976).

As a result, suggests Chale, ideas were often in conflict. Trustees and superintendents thought it best to proceed cautiously and economically. Principals put priority on immediate help and most often held individual tutoring to be of highest importance. Classroom teachers were willing to accept help if it meant that someone would take care of, or provide a cure for, a troublesome child. In most school divisions no one told these teachers or their principals the job description that was envisioned. Most parents were satisfied by the existence of the resource teacher. At least there was someone with whom they could consult (Chale 1979). First, it was assumed that minimal training and experience requirements would assure the adequate performance of resource teachers in their job; second, that children with "specific learning disabilities" could be neatly categorized; and third, that school divisions understood the concept of resource teaching, and would be committed to its implementation (Cenerini 1980).

The situation at the secondary level was somewhat different. At this time, segregated special education programs for the educably mentally handicapped and the learning disabled were in place. Some children were integrated into the mainstream if

the special education teachers felt that it would be possible. Many regular education students encountered difficulty, but they often behaved in a way that could account for their poor progress. Teachers were not easily motivated to consult with a resource teacher to modify programs for students who were a problem to them. They thought that if the student truly could not handle the regular program, he or she should have been placed in the special education program. Therefore, the problems must be discipline, and this area of difficulty was the guidance counsellor's responsibility.

Another obstacle to the secondary program at this time, was the lack of program materials and strategies at this level. Students whose academic progress had not improved through remediation at the elementary level were not willing to try more of the same at the secondary level. Acceptance by peers was a student goal and a program which differed from that of one's classmates did not foster inclusion in one's peer group. Teachers were subject area specialists and resource teachers did not have their content knowledge, the concept of data-based instruction was new and did not fit into the present instructional practice, and teachers were afraid of a decline of standards if programs were modified. Programs were oriented to the curriculum and divisional final exams rather than to grouping students or using assignments at many different difficulty levels.

In 1980, the Department of Education provided categorical grants to school divisions for students with handicapping conditions who required some direct service to function in the mainstream. These Low Incidence grants were in addition to the block grant used to provide resource teacher service to High Incidence students. They were used by some school divisions to provide additional resource teacher services and by other school divisions to provide paraprofessional assistance. The purpose was to provide additional assistance to students so that they could be successfully integrated. In 1984 many of the junior high school special education classes were closed and students were "mainstreamed."

The writer experienced a change in role as a result of this "mainstreaming" and the Level One grants. Because the school division in the study chose to use the grants to increase resource teacher numbers rather than to provide additional paraprofessional service, Department of Education officials required that the resource teacher provide direct service for a designated time period. The resource teacher workload increased dramatically. Since the identification of more students resulted in

more assistance, resource teachers were encouraged to increase applications to reduce their workload.

The increase in numbers of resource teachers became a concern in some schools. Another concern was the blurring of the resource teacher role. The policy had clearly supported a collaborative-consultative model and now with the advent of required direct service, everyone was confused. This situation changed in 1988 when the Department of Education added the grant for Level One Low Incidence students to the existing High Incidence block grant and gave control of this grant to the school divisions. Categorical funding remained for Levels Two and Three Low Incidence students. At the time of this study, the proposed change of the Level One grant had been announced but not yet implemented.

A Personal Perspective on the Problem of Change

Attempting to implement a collaborative-consultative resource teacher model at the secondary level has been difficult for the writer. Initially the problem was to gain acceptance of this role by the staff. Although the division had decided that this role was to be policy, many teachers were resistant to this idea. This resistance resulted in many informal discussions on the benefits of the program and formal inservicing of the staff. By the end of the writer's first year, it appeared that the teachers were beginning to accept the new role.

The next year the phasing out of the special education classes for the learning disabled at the grade seven level resulted in an increased caseload. Because school enrollment dropped, resource time was cut. Now that teachers were more accepting of help, time became a problem. However, progress in the development of the consulting role continued to be made.

The following year the caseload again increased because of the closure of the remaining special education classes and because of the increasing tutorial demands of the specially funded students. It appeared that the consultative resource role would be effective, if only the caseload was more appropriate. Because time was consumed providing direct service, it was almost impossible to observe in the classroom or find time to consult. Yet program modifications were occurring and teachers were consulting.

The following year resource teacher time was increased at my school. One more full time resource teacher and two part-time resource teachers were added to the staff. In addition, a large turnover of classroom teachers occurred. I was optimistic about these changes but the result was very different from my expectations. It became clear that not all schools had developed the consultation role similarly and many of the teachers from other schools were not accepting of this resource teacher function. The school staff resented the addition of more resource teachers and did not understand special education funding. Many felt that their class sizes could be reduced if the number of resource teachers were decreased. The result of increasing the number of resource teachers within the school seemed to be the instant destruction of a consultative program that had taken three years to develop. Teachers were resistant and uncooperative.

The change was sudden and dramatic. Why did this happen? The writer could not answer this question. There seemed to be so many influences. Every year the program seemed to be different. Discussion of this problem with colleagues at the secondary level within and outside the school division revealed that their problems were similar. The desire to anticipate the effect of changes within the school and the effect of changes imposed from without motivated the pursuit of this study.

It seemed imperative to determine if a collaborative-consultative resource program could be implemented at the secondary level so that resource teachers and classroom teachers could consult and develop appropriate programs for mainstreamed students, and, if this consultation was a desirable pursuit, what were the factors that affected it? An understanding of the dynamics of this consultant role and the effect it has on the operation of the school seemed to be necessary for the resource program to function and for the resource teacher to feel useful and successful. To this end, this study attempts to identify variables within and outside the school that may affect the collaborative-consultative resource teacher model. It also attempts to describe the current state of implementation at the junior high school level and to relate the school program to conditions within the school.

The Purpose

It was the purpose of this study to describe and analyze the current state of the consultative resource program in a suburban city school division. The specific aims were:

1. to collect information from teachers, administrators and resource teachers about the degree to which a consultation model was in use in their schools.
2. to analyze the school factors of climate, administrator, teacher and consultant to determine the relationship between these variables and the degree to which a consultation model was in use in the schools studied.

Design and Procedures

Setting

This study was conducted in a medium sized suburban school division which had used a consultative resource program for nine years (an outline of the resource model is in Appendix A) . Information was collected from the teaching and administrative staff of five junior high schools.

The Study Instruments

To gather data on the resource program in this division, resource teachers and administrators were personally interviewed (interview schedules in Appendix B). A questionnaire, (Appendix C), was given to classroom teachers.

The initial draft of the questionnaire contained items utilizing information drawn from the literature review that were intended to determine the degree to which a consultation model was in use and to describe the school climate, administrator, teacher and consultant variables. The school climate variables of organization and politics were not included in the study. The climate variable of trust was only questioned indirectly because of its sensitivity. The interview schedules were constructed parallel to the questionnaire.

The draft questionnaire was submitted to a panel of teachers, resource teachers, and administrators familiar with resource teacher services at the junior high

school level in the school division studied to obtain their view of the instrument (Appendix D). In addition, the draft was submitted to a professional who designs and conducts surveys. The questionnaire was revised on the basis of these responses. This revised draft and the draft interview schedules were submitted to the Faculty of Education, University of Manitoba Ethics Review Committee and were again revised to meet with this committee's guidelines.

Procedures

All respondents were advised that individual responses and schools were to remain confidential and that a report on the study would be available on request. To ensure confidentiality, no names of respondents or schools appeared on the questionnaire.

Resource teachers were asked to support and assist in the distribution and return of the teacher questionnaire. The questionnaires were distributed to the resource teachers in early May, 1988. The resource teachers placed them in the teachers' mailboxes and discussed the purpose of the study at their May staff meeting. They informed the teachers that they supported the study, that all responses and schools would remain confidential, and that results would be made available on request.

Three weeks later, a follow up letter (Appendix E) was sent to the resource teachers for distribution to all teachers. After three weeks, resource teachers were telephoned and asked to encourage teachers to reply. Three weeks after that, resource teachers were again contacted. The low rate of return was indicated and further requests were made to encourage the teachers to respond. Teachers returned the questionnaires individually through the divisional delivery service.

Interviews were conducted with all resource teachers and all administrators in the five schools studied. Resource teachers and administrators were interviewed individually for approximately 45 minutes. They were told that the information collected would be used for a thesis study, that all responses and schools would remain confidential, and that they were free to decline to answer at any time. The purpose of the study was explained and they were told that the results would be made available on request.

Questionnaire Rate of Return

Questionnaires were sent to all teachers in the five schools but most of the teachers in the larger schools taught in specialized areas that did not require program modification or the use of the resource teacher. At one school these teachers requested to not complete the questionnaire and returned them. At the other schools some of the questionnaires were simply not returned. In addition, many teachers indicated that the questionnaires were too time consuming and while expressing a desire to complete them, did not in fact, do so. Administrators indicated that many such questionnaires had been distributed the previous year and the teachers had felt that this method of gathering data had been overused.

Using approximate numbers of teachers in major subject areas as respondents rather than all junior high school teachers, the return rate was 37%. However, differences did exist among the schools. Anacreon, Dr. Darrell and Bayata junior high schools had similar return rates of approximately 33.3%. Esbak Junior High had a return rate of 6% and Commason Junior High had a return rate of 60% of all teachers (fictitious names used). Because of this low rate of return, the data from the questionnaires are combined with the administrator interview data in the case studies. No questionnaire responses are reported for Esbak Junior High.

Analysis of Data

Responses from the questionnaires and interviews were analyzed to develop a description of the collaborative-consultative resource programs and of each of the school variables of climate, administrator, teacher, and consultant. Relationships between variables were also examined through the development of case studies for each school.

Assumptions and Limitations

This study assumed that responses were made in good faith, and that the data received accurately reflected the beliefs and practices of the respondents. The major limitation of the study is the poor rate of questionnaire return.

It could be assumed that the questionnaires returned were completed by teachers who had attitudes more favorable to the resource program. If this was the

case, these responses could reflect a more positive attitude than that which would have resulted if the return rate had been higher. It could also be assumed that the questionnaires were completed by teachers with negative attitudes towards the resource program or that the low return rate was due to a lack of consultation experience with the resource teacher. Because of the many possible reasons for this rate of return, the study cannot claim to accurately indicate the opinions of junior high school classroom teachers in the division as a whole.

To put the questionnaire response data in perspective for the reader, actual numbers of respondents are given rather than percentages. This should more easily allow readers to formulate their own opinions of the generalizability of the responses and the relationships of the data.

Data Interpretation

The data are presented in case study format. Each school in the study is a unique entity and the development of the resource programs within each school is best understood by considering the school as a whole. Generalizations about the factors as they may apply to entire school divisions or to individual schools are made as a result of the patterns that emerged through the case studies. This study attempts to isolate factors that could be used in further studies and represents an initial attempt to make sense of a highly complex role in an interdependent system of roles.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Traditionally, resource teachers provided service to students in a tutorial fashion. Students were categorized as a result of diagnostic testing and special education was set apart from regular education. This categorical approach legitimized the inflexibility of schools and maintained an expectancy that students were to adapt to school programs. As a result, resource teachers functioned separately from classroom teachers and often neither party was aware of what the other was doing (Will 1986).

Another way to provide resource teacher service was initiated in the late 1960's. This consultative approach emphasizes maintaining students in their regular classes and thus supports the concept of mainstreaming. Resource teachers act as consultants to classroom teachers in order to assist them with the development of programs for their special education students. A consultant is a person in a position to have some influence over an individual, a group, or an organization, but who has no direct power to make changes or to implement programs. The role of teacher-consultant within a school is a relatively new one and may be difficult to implement.

The Evolution of a Consultative Approach to Resource Teacher Service

The resource teacher-consultant is a special educator who works largely in educational diagnosis, preparing instructional objectives to be used primarily by other teachers in their work with students having unique needs. This consultant supports the work of handicapped or learning-disabled children in the regular class (Sabatino 1972). Consulting teachers assist with referred problems in regular class settings, help students transfer newly acquired skills from resource to regular class settings and assist teachers in the use of new instructional techniques (Idol-Maestas, Lloyd, and Lilly 1981). A consultant has influence but no direct power to make change or implement programs (Block 1981).

The change of role from special educator to teacher consultant has been advocated throughout North America largely because of the increased practice of mainstreaming special education students. Mainstreaming or maintaining special education students in regular classes has become more common because of an

increased perception of the failure of pullout special education programs to meet student needs (Will 1986) and because educating these students in the mainstream has been shown to be largely effective (Wang and Birch 1984). Moreover, "effective schools" research indicates that public schools are designing achievement oriented environments for all students (Idol Maestas et al. 1984).

Effectiveness of the Resource Teacher Consultant Approach

Speece and Mandell (1980) assessed the delivery of support services from resource teachers to elementary classroom teachers involved in mainstreaming learning disabled students. A list of 26 services was developed from the literature and was distributed to 228 regular education teachers who were asked to rate the importance and frequency of occurrence of each service. Regular educators rated nine of the services provided by resource teacher consultants as critical for effective mainstreaming. Only two (remedial instruction and informal student progress meetings) occurred on a regular basis. (Provincial Teachers' Society 1985)

Data -based instructional practices advocate that program goals for students are derived from an analysis of student behaviors and that instruction is directed toward achieving desired behaviors. Instructional objectives are revised according to progress appraisals. Deno (1972) provided a collection of data-based models which indicated that a data-based model could be used to train students effectively and could provide appropriate service to handicapped learners in regular classrooms.

Medway (1979), in his review of consultation research published between 1972 and 1977, found that 76% of the research reported at least one or more positive effects resulting from consultation intervention. He concludes that the practice does appear to be effective in modifying the behavior and attitudes of consultees and their clients and is being well received by school personnel .

Resource room models provide remedial programs to minimize students' academic deficiencies. However, skills acquired in one setting most often do not generalize to other settings (Mishel 1968). When no attention is paid to transfer or the demands of the natural environment, student gains made in the resource room decrease rapidly in the regular classroom (Deshler, Alley, Warner and Schumaker 1981). When care is taken to ensure transfer and attention is paid to regular

classroom demands, students can be successful (Anderson-Inman 1981). Close cooperation between special and regular educators is necessary for this to occur.

Knight, Meyers, Paolucci-Whitcomb, Hasazi and Nevin (1981) evaluated the effects of consulting teacher service on reading and math achievement of mildly handicapped children in a four year comparison. They found a significant difference in test scores between those students who had received consulting service and those who had not. In addition, the service group maintained its initial gain in achievement while the non-service group gained at a much slower rate .

The evidence suggests that the consultation approach is not only successful, but necessary if students are to maintain the gains they make with direct assistance. Consultation is a way to assist classroom teachers in developing the necessary skills for mainstreaming and may also make classrooms more accommodating for all students.

Models of Consultation

Various consultation models have been identified. The models of resource teacher consultation to date have relied on an inquiry approach (Bravi 1976, Cipani 1985, Deno 1970, Knight, Meyers, Paolucci-Whitcomb, Hasazi and Nevin 1981, Prouty 1970). This perspective concentrates on defining the problem, developing a tentative answer, testing the hypothesis, developing a conclusion and applying it (Bravi 1976). Decision making is collaborative while data-collection activities are the primary responsibility of the resource teacher (Bravi 1979). Heavy emphasis is placed on the use of data-based instruction as first introduced by Deno (1970).

Tharpe and Wetsel (1969) and Tharpe (1975) described and researched the triadic model of consultation. This conceptual model includes three components: the consultant, the mediator, and the target. Their model places the consultee as the mediator of change between the consultant and the person in whom the behavior change is sought (target). The mediator is typically the classroom teacher, the person who can achieve the goal of assisting the target; the consultant is typically the person with knowledge or skills to mobilize the mediator's influence. The triadic model was conceptual model that attempted to use a process approach to consultation.

A process approach (Block 1981, Brokes, 1975) is generally advocated for resource teacher consultants. This process approach emphasizes a cooperative

approach to problem identification and problem solving, as well as a shared responsibility for implementation. A collaborative, or cooperative approach, is designed to promote consultee ownership and minimize resistance. The inquiry model and process model have been combined and used as the basis for many resource teacher consultant models such as the Vermont Consulting Teacher Training Program (Paolucci-Whitcomb and Nevin 1985).

The University of Illinois Resource Consulting Teacher Program (Idol-Maestas, Lloyd and Lilly 1981, Idol-Maestas 1983), Project Con Sept at Pacific Lutheran University (Idol-Maestas et al. 1984) and the Triadic Model of Collaborative Consultation (Idol-Maestas, Nevin and Paolucci-Whitcomb 1984) from the Universities of Illinois and Vermont are further refinements of the combination of inquiry and process models. They emphasize data-based instruction, curriculum-based assessment and effective problem-solving and communication skills. They rely on collaboration between the consultant (resource teacher) and the mediator (classroom teacher), are based on mutual cooperation and are manifested in formal training as well as formal consultation.

These consulting programs share the philosophy, that, with appropriate planning and interventions, effective educational programs can be provided for mainstreamed students. Data support this philosophy (Deno 1972, Deshler, Alley, Warner and Schumaker 1981, Knight, Meyers, Paolucci-Whitcomb, Hasazi, and Nevin 1980, Idol-Maestas, Lloyd and Lilly 1981, Miller and Sabatino 1978, and Wang and Birch 1984). However, obstacles to a successful program occur in implementation. Resource teacher-consultants have noted a lack of time and administrative support for consultation (Idol-Maestas and Ritter 1985) as well as teacher resistance to mainstreaming (Gallagher 1985) as possible reasons for unsuccessful implementation.

Factors Related to Implementation of Consultation

The factors that appear to be necessary for effective consultation are many. It is necessary to have a consultation model established and to have the support of the administrator in carrying out the consultant role. It is helpful if the school climate is supportive of change and the teachers are prepared for the use of a consultant. Teachers' attitudes to mainstreaming and individualization of instruction as well as their willingness to be open about their lack of training and expertise also influence successful implementation. Lastly, the consultant, herself, is a major determinant of

success. She must treat teachers with respect throughout the process, be able to handle conflict, be an expert in communication skills, be able to manage change so that it is not intolerable nor ineffective, be an expert on procedural strategies, maintain equal responsibility through the consultation stages and effectively provide feedback so that the mediator can identify success. This is clearly a difficult job. Knowledge of how to handle conflict situations, practice of appropriate responses and support may be an ongoing requirement.

System and School Factors

Carner, in Judith Apter's book, Psychological Consultation in Educational Settings (Apter 1982), suggests that the consultant's success depends on negotiating sanction through all levels of the system's hierarchy. She states that consultation theory considers the basic dilemma of how to effect change. Weinstein, in the same book, suggests that the consultant working at an individual level is frequently forced into serving as a feedback mechanism between teachers and administration while the school's response to problems never changes. He stresses that institutional influences control new programs in the classroom. Schools have a loose structure which is framed around the autonomy of classrooms where individual solutions are stressed and relationships between staff are minimized (Weinstein 1982).

To a large extent, teachers "own" their classrooms, collaborate and interact little with their co-called colleagues, and are difficult to supervise or direct (Hart 1989).

Corbett, Dawson and Firestone (1984) describe eight school conditions that affect any school project. These conditions are: (1) availability of school resources, (2) incentive, (3) school organization characteristics (special efforts are necessary due to loose coupling), (4) school and district priorities, (5) politics (competing interests of different groups), (6) staff turnover, (7) the amount of behavior change required (if too ambitious it may fail; if too congruent it may be too trivial), and (8) cumulative residue of prior projects. They also encourage the use of external field agents, sequential and systematic planning and the encouragement of teacher participation. Special care must be taken to institutionalize the change or it will disappear. Without organizational support, an individual's impact on a school is muted by the attitudes, beliefs and actions of other school members as they pursue their own purposes.

Seymour Sarason, in The Culture of the School and the Problem of Change (1971) argues that the school is a culture and that teaching any subject matter is in part determined by the structural or system characteristics of this culture that have no intrinsic relationship to the subject matter. He feels that any attempt to change a curriculum independent of change in some institutional feature runs the risk of partial or complete failure.

Sarason also suggests that the culture of the junior high school is very different from the culture of the elementary school. Junior high school teachers view themselves as specialists in subject matter and view the junior high school pupil as a young adult. These variations in culture may result in a different impact of change at the secondary level, a different effect on the consultant role and a different attitude towards mainstreaming. In a study on mainstreaming conducted by a Western Canadian Teachers' Society in 1984-5, junior high school teachers viewed the effects of integration more negatively than elementary teachers.

Dealing with teacher resistance to change or consultation is a part of the consultative process. When implementing a consultative resource model, not only is the model itself a change, but the resource teacher becomes a change agent within the school, who is constantly dealing with effecting change. Change that brings with it a shift in power is the most difficult to accept (Kee 1980). The resource teacher-consultant changes the power structure for classroom teachers and administrators and thus, may be unacceptable to both. When status is eroded, conflict tends to arise (Kee 1980).

Administrator Influences

Cox (1983) identified principals, external assisters and central office personnel as important to school change efforts. Principals who were successful in implementing change made sure that: (1) all teachers were aware that successful implementation of the practice was a top priority, (2) the requisite materials were available, (3) teachers had ready access to personnel who were experienced with the practice, (4) teachers were given time to use the practice, (5) the schoolwide climate was conducive to continuous, systematic problem solving, (6) teachers understood the expectation that all the components of the practice were to be implemented, (7) when all of the above were in place, teachers were allowed to figure out on their own how to meet the

expectations, and (8) teachers, parents, and central administrators were working in a realistic time frame and did not feel pressured by premature evaluations.

Friend (1984) identified some of the stumbling blocks to consultation. Lack of time for consultation and administration hesitation to implement the program with consultation time are two such stumbling blocks. Idol-Maestas, Nevin and Paolucci-Whitcomb (1984) feel that 20-40% of the consultant's day should be devoted to consultation. Administrators, they suggest, feel that special education teachers are teachers and should be with students like other teachers. They may also feel that the other school staff see consulting time as extra free time for teachers who already have special privileges. Sarason (1971) reported that the principal became upset when he found out that the clinic member had consulted with the teacher to work out and implement a new procedure or approach. This example was used to illustrate the difficulty some administrators may have allowing a teacher to assume a role that closely resembles their own in its ability to develop curriculum and provide instructional leadership as well as in the freedom to plan one's day without the restriction of a rigid timetable. To be effective, consultants must be free to talk to teachers, observe in their classrooms and together develop a plan of action that will facilitate the educational progress of target students.

Classroom Teacher Influences

The use of a consultant may threaten teachers in many ways. Sarason states that teachers find it extremely difficult to say that they are having difficulty presenting subject matter or that students are having difficulty learning in their classes (Sarason 1971). Although some teachers may not be hesitant to refer students to the resource teacher, they may often wish confirmation of their teaching ability rather than assistance changing instructional practices. Powell and Posner (1978) state that fear of the unknown and fear of failure and frustration as well as the threat of change in social relations, to status and to pride in proficiency at the existing job cause resistance. Often, teachers feel that they do not have the skill to deal with the mainstreamed child or they may not support a mainstreaming philosophy. They may be hesitant to implement a change because of genuine concern for the child (Hasazi 1976), because the suggested change is not realistic, or because the consultant lacks credibility (Spadek 1982). Resistance may also be understood as a useful defensive mechanism against hasty or unwarranted change.

The use of a consultant has not been part of the school system for long, and as a result, teachers have not generally been prepared to act as a consultee. Carner states that there are several categories of understanding that a consultee must learn in order to benefit from the consultant's skills. These include: (1) learning how to present relevant information about the problem client; (2) what kind of help to expect from consultation; (3) what the consultant has to offer; and (4) learning about his or her own style of response and how it may affect a situation (Carner 1982). Problems of resistance may result from this difference in professional preparation for consultation.

An essential theme in the resource teacher-consultant-classroom teacher relationship is the belief that general classroom instruction can be modified so that handicapped students can learn without undue hardship or decreased learning for normal classmates. This infers that students in graded classrooms could receive various forms and levels of instruction at various times and that the teacher does not always have to be the person to directly teach the students. Classroom teachers who believe that: (1) all students should receive the same instruction at the same time; (2) all students of the same age should learn the same knowledge; (3) the best way to instruct is to teach to the "average"; (4) the professional teacher is the best person to directly teach students; or (5) the role of the teacher is to teach children, not to make them behave, will have difficulty using a variety of teaching methods and difficulty integrating handicapped students (Idol-Maestas, Nevin and Paolucci-Whitcomb 1984).

In some situations, it may be advisable to not consult with some classroom teachers. Conoley and Conoley have identified four conditions that might signal no entry or a discontinuation of consultation services. These conditions were: (1) extremely autocratic or unsupportive administrators; (2) a system in extreme crisis; (3) a system with an overwhelming need for direct services; or (4) a large percentage of children who were hungry, tired, or abused (Conoley and Conoley 1982). When the forces restricting consultation are equal to or greater than the forces facilitating it, consultants may need to redesign their activities until conditions change or until they can obtain assistance to change the enabling conditions.

Consultant Influences - Variables of Knowledge, Attitude and Role

Consultants may use one of three roles. An "Expert" role implies that the consultant is to solve the problem and thus will be held responsible for results. In this role, the clients do not learn how to resolve their own problems (Bravi 1986) and the students are not able to generalize their skills to new settings (Deshler 1981). The "Pair-of-Hands" role implies that the client retains full control and the consultant is to apply specialized knowledge to implement the manager's goals. A major drawback of this role is that the consultant can become a scapegoat (Block 1981). When consultants work in a collaborative role, they don't "solve" the problems; they help the client solve the problems. The consultant and the manager become interdependent. They share responsibility, decision making and data collection. Communication is two-way and responsibilities are determined by discussion and agreement. The consultant's goal is to solve problems so that they stay solved. This collaborative role is the one suggested in most resource teacher consultant models (Erger and Lates 1975, Idol-Maestas 1983, Idol-Maestas et al. 1984, Idol-Maestas, Lloyd and Lilly 1981, Idol-Maestas, Nevin and Paolucci-Whitcomb 1984, Paolucci-Whitcomb and Nevin 1985, Tharpe 1975).

The problems with collaboration are many. Block (1981) states that consultants working for administrators that wish quick solutions are often seen as indifferent or as "dragging their feet". Administrators who prefer the "pair-of-hands" role may interpret collaboration as insubordination. Consultants, themselves, fear a dilution of their expertise. Collaboration can come across as implying equal expertise. Collaboration, he suggests, should not occur on the technical aspects of the problem, but should occur on how the stages of consultation will be carried out. The way this process is managed will affect the client's use of the technical expertise. The client should be involved in the process without downplaying the consultant's expertise.

Block (1981) maintains that in order to manage the collaborative role successfully it is necessary to follow a series of stages. He identifies these stages as defining the problem, deciding to proceed with the project, selecting dimensions to be studied, deciding who will be involved, selecting the method of data collection, collecting the data, funnelling the data, summarizing and organizing it, feedback of

results, making recommendations, and decision on actions. Block states that each of these steps is a series of opportunities to engage the client, reduce resistance, and increase the probabilities of success. To do this, it is necessary to constantly ensure that each phase involves a sharing of responsibility. It is very easy, her suggests, to assume an "expert" or "pair of hands" role rather than a collaborative one and the resource teacher must be aware of communication strategies necessary to manage these stages.

Lippitt and Lippitt (1986) have also identified important stages of consultation. For each of these stages or phases they identify critical intervention questions which focus on behaviors necessary for the development of consulting skills. Lippitt and Lippitt feel that a consultant must be able to react to "critical moments" with a large repertoire of responses. They also feel that value criteria must also be considered. The consultant must be careful to keep her distance, to reject responses that would cause the client to feel guilty, defensive or angry, be aware of system effects caused by their working relationship, consider the degree of influence they should exert and balance change with support so as not to make stress intolerable. By paying attention to the stages of consultation, the goals of each stage and the communication skills necessary for success, the resource teacher consultant can increase the probability of success, and maintain the detachment necessary to respond in an effective manner.

Idol-Maestas, Nevin and Paolucci-Whitcomb (1984) feel that consultants must be aware of six principles of consultation. These communication principles include: (1) the use of principles for situational leadership; (2) cooperative goal structures; (3) use of appropriate interview skills; (4) use of active listening principles; (5) use of jargon-free language; and (6) the utilization of positive nonverbal language. They further acknowledge four principles of collaboration that are important in the triadic model. They are: (1) team ownership of the problem; (2) recognition of individual differences in developmental progress as these affect the target, the mediator and the consultant; (3) reinforcement principles; and (4) making data-based decisions .

In addition to the use of appropriate communication strategies, successful consultants must recommend effective procedural strategies for general classrooms suggest Idol-Maestas, Nevin and Paolucci-Whitcomb (1984). These strategies should: (1) be easy to implement in general classroom settings; (2) be designed for use with any student who is achieving poorly; (3) be based on the use of classroom curricula; (4) include components that teach students to generalize; (5) be useful for

group instruction; and (6) directly teach students the skills they are required to master.

Idol-Maestas, Nevin and Paolucci-Whitcomb (1984) suggest that evaluation is another important aspect of the consultation process. All parties involved in the program should be responsible for and directly involved in evaluation. This may include teachers, parents, administrators and other support personnel. These persons should work as a team to identify and evaluate various program components. By evaluating the program together not only does the consultant receive valuable feedback but successes are noted and thus all parties are encouraged to see the consultation process positively.

It is also important that the consultant be casual and vulnerable. McDonald calls casual consultation "one-legged conferencing" and states that the ability to talk in the hallways and ask about progress is a successful technique when used consistently over time. He also states that observation with feedback is one of the consultant's most powerful tools but only if both parties share responsibility and vulnerability. Both of these processes are effective over time. There is no "quick" way to effectively consult (McDonald 1989).

Summary

Although change hurts and conflict and resistance often results (Montgomery 1978), successful consultation is possible. There are many factors influencing it, however, and these factors constantly change and influence each other as well as influence consultation directly. These factors may be described as system factors and school factors.

The senior administrators within a school system, influenced by political and societal demands, attempt to initiate a change. They must provide sanction for the change and the necessary resources to overcome the effects of loose coupling in the school organization and teacher apprehension and mistrust.

The school staff attempts to effect the change, which, in this study, is consultation. The effectiveness of any change is enhanced or destroyed by school conditions or factors. These may be described as school climate, administrator influence and teacher (consultee) attitudes. Within this environment, the consultant

acts as a change agent continually attempting to implement change and to change attitudes and climate. This factor may be described as consultant behaviour.

Each of these major factors is composed of many minor factors, which, together, form the major factor. These minor factors change, grow and decline in importance and affect each other. The result is an ever evolving "school influence" which may produce its own version of consultation. (Figure one summarizes the factors influencing consultation.) This "school influence" is also affected by what Sarason calls the culture of the school. Sarason lists tentative characteristics of the school culture that could adversely interfere with the objectives of change. Three that seem to apply to the implementation of a consultative resource teacher role at the secondary level are,

It is extremely difficult for a child in school to state that he does not know something without such a statement being viewed by him and others as stupidity.

It is extremely difficult for a teacher to state to the principal, other teachers, or supervisors that she does not understand something or that in certain respects her teaching is not getting over to the pupils.

One of the most frequent complaints of teachers is that the school culture forces them to adhere to a curriculum from which they do not feel free to deviate, and, as a result, they do not feel they can, as one teachers said, "use [their] own heads." (Sarason 1971)

This study will describe the factors of school climate, administrator, classroom teacher and resource teacher and will attempt to determine the relationships between them. Better understanding of these factors and their influence upon each other will be developed through the descriptions of the schools and their resource programs.

CHAPTER THREE

A REVIEW OF THE STUDY FINDINGS

The purpose of this study was to describe and the current state of the consultative resource program in a suburban city school division which had a policy advocating use of such a program for nine years. In this chapter, the divisional policy will be reviewed, followed by a presentation of the data. This study considered administrator, teacher, consultant and school climate factors. These factors will be discussed for each school in a case study format. A synthesis of the findings for the entire division will conclude the chapter.

Divisional Policies

The following divisional policy is taken from the School Division Resource Teacher Handbook.

Diagnostic-Collaborative (DC)

Introduction

The current emphasis upon providing educational programs for students with special needs within the mainstream of education makes the development of functional support services imperative. The program aims at facilitating and supporting programming for students with exceptional needs within the mainstream of education.

The resource teacher is a member of the educational team and as such can function effectively if there is general agreement about the goal for the program, the operational model, and the respective responsibilities and relationships among all members of the educational team. The resource teacher's main function is to provide basic skills instruction to students with learning problems and to work directly with subject area teachers to assist them with instructional techniques, classroom management and program adjustments that would allow these students to work more successfully in the classroom.

I. Referral

The referring teacher submits a written referral to the resource teacher through the principal, outlining the teaching/learning problem as he/she perceives it. This form is aimed at acquiring pertinent information concerning teacher's perceptions of the student's behavior and other factors related to the problem. It also requests information concerning steps already taken to resolve the difficulty.

II. Referral Conference

The resource teacher confers with the referring teacher (and principal if required) to review the referral and together plan diagnostic procedures. The referral conference serves to attempt to clarify the reason(s) for the referral, and to pinpoint specific behaviors that are of concern to the teacher.

III. Diagnostic Procedures

a) Observation

It is desirable that the resource teacher observe the referred student in the regular classroom setting.

b) Tests

Tests may be administered by the resource teacher to obtain concrete data regarding the student's:

- vision and hearing
- instructional level
- academic strengths and weaknesses
- learning styles
- behavioral patterns
- programming
- placement

On the basis of this systematic process of diagnostic procedures, inferences are drawn and tentative instructional strategies constructed, to be tried during the diagnostic teaching phase

(c) Diagnostic teaching

Diagnostic teaching is conducted individually or in a small group setting by the resource teacher to determine appropriate teaching techniques and materials based on the student's strengths and needs. The diagnostic teaching can take place in the classroom or in the resource room setting.

IV. Educational Planning

a) Conference

A conference is arranged between the referring teacher and the resource teacher (also the principal if required) to discuss the diagnostic findings and to formulate program plans.

The resource teacher and referring teacher together evolve an educational plan for the student. Explanation of and open discussion about diagnostic procedures result in program and/or classroom modifications mutually agreed upon.

b) Educational Plan

The Educational Plan designed by the referring teacher and the resource teacher should include :

1. diagnostic information
2. specific objectives
3. recommend methods, materials and resources
4. the roles and responsibilities of the resource teacher and of the referring teacher
5. monitoring and evaluation procedures
6. parental contact

A written educational report is prepared, recommending well-defined techniques, materials and implementation strategies already tested and found workable which are compatible with classroom organization.

It is important that the referring teacher claims "ownership" of the referred student.

V. Follow-up

The resource teacher will facilitate implementation of the educational plan. It is during this period that the referring teacher generally formulates his/her perceptions of the educational plan. During this time, problems concerning the utilization of the educational plan can be resolved. This may result in revision and/or modification of the initial educational plan, and the modified/revised program implementation is repeated if necessary.

After the program has been implemented, the resource teacher and the referring teacher will review the educational plan and will make any necessary revisions. The resource teacher will consult with teachers on an "as needed" basis concerning previously referred cases.

The resource teacher provides implementation assistance for the necessary period of time along with demonstrations as requested.

"The first priority is not to serve the child but to get the teacher hooked on success. When you remove the child, you remove the reason for change."

VI. Case Closure

The case will be closed when the resource teacher, the referring teacher, and the principal view the student's progress as satisfactory.

When assessment of educational planning objectives indicate mastery, the case will be closed. The resource teacher does not assume responsibility for and/or "ownership" of the problem. The resource teacher provides service for all teachers in the school and therefore cannot continue monitoring a situation once the objectives of the initial referral have been met. However, the resource teacher will consult with teachers on an "as needed" basis concerning previously referred cases.

In addition to the resource teacher policy, this school division had a policy on unit staffing. The unit staffing policy provided guidelines to principals for staffing and also credited them with "units" of teachers that could be used to staff the school. One staffing unit for every 500 students was given to each school for a resource teacher. This was added to the school total units when the Diagnostic/Collaborative Resource Program was implemented. In addition, the schools were given additional staffing units for students identified as 'slow learning' according to a divisional formula and as 'Low Incidence' according to Department of Education criteria. The Low Incidence funds were monitored by the Department of Education and were to be used to provide additional assistance to the identified students. This school division used these funds to provide additional resource or classroom teachers for tutorial assistance. The principals often chose to use the Divisional funds given for slow learning students in much the same way as the 'Low Incidence' grant. In this manner, the number of resource teachers in each school had gradually increased over time and they had gradually assumed a more tutorial role.

Commason and Dr. Darrell Junior High schools had provided extra classroom teacher tutorial service rather than using only resource teachers for this assistance. The result was a higher resource caseload at these two schools, as the classroom teacher tutorial time was not used to provide service to students referred to the resource teacher, but was used instead, to provide tutorial service to other students. The resource teachers were required to provide service to Low Incidence students in addition to following the divisional resource model. This was similar to other schools, but, the resource time at these schools had been decreased to allow the classroom

teachers to have tutorial time. Resource teachers were also given some responsibility for the administration of the teacher tutorial program.

Both Commason and Dr. Darrell were small schools and this use of unit staffing had been a response to the difficulty of staffing the school with specialists using the enrollment based unit staffing formula. The administrator at Commason had previously been the principal at Dr. Darrell and had initiated the teacher tutorial program at that school. When he was transferred to Commason, the program was implemented there. The new administrator at Dr. Darrell continued the program.

The data will be presented in a case study format which will include the responses from the interviews and the questionnaires. Commason Junior High is the only school which had an adequate questionnaire rate of return. Since the questionnaires represent the views of the classroom teachers, no conclusions about the opinions of the teachers at the other schools can be drawn and similarly no conclusions can be drawn at the Divisional level. Case studies of Commason and Dr. Darrell will be presented first.

Case Study One: Commason Junior High

The case study of Commason Junior High is interesting because it best shows the effect of the consultant on the school. The resource teacher in this school seemed to be able to use collaboration extremely well. She provided direct assistance to students while attempting to maintain responsibility for student programs with the staff. The staff at this school had the most positive attitude towards mainstreaming and program modification. Even though the resource teacher did not use all of the stages in the resource teacher policy because of a heavy caseload and lack of time, she did involve students and parents a great deal and practised McDonald's "one - legged consultation" (McDonald 1989). Classroom teachers described her as "always there".

The staff, generally, did not have a strategy in place for the solution of problems and the leadership style of the administrator was "top down". At the beginning of the year, resource programs did not seem to be a priority (evidenced by the lack of resource teacher time in the school), but the principal had planned to change this by eliminating the teacher tutorial program and increasing the resource

teacher position to full time. This seems to show that the consultant has some impact on the priority of the resource program.

The School

Commason Junior High had a teaching staff of 15 individuals filling 13.5 teaching positions. At the time the data for this study were collected, three of these teachers taught in the school on a part time basis. One taught mathematics in the mornings only, one was the resource teacher and one was the guidance counsellor. The resource teacher and the guidance counsellor worked all day on alternate days of the six day cycle and, as a result, rarely saw each other. One paraprofessional was employed full time to assist the resource teacher, as well as mainstreamed special education students. Students were given direct assistance by the paraprofessional individually or in small groups and the paraprofessional assisted the resource teacher when remedial instruction was provided by the resource teacher.

All but one of the teachers taught in a major subject area for at least part of the day. Since program modifications usually involve the major subject areas such as mathematics, language arts, science and social studies, almost all of the teachers could be expected to have some interaction with the resource teacher at some time or another.

Only four staff members had been in the school five or more years. The resource teacher was one of three teachers who were new to the school at the beginning of the fall term. Two staff members (one returning from leave; one new) began their duties at the beginning of the Spring term. Two of the new teachers were recent graduates with no previous teaching experience.

When asked to describe the way in which new programs were implemented and the attitude of the staff to problem solving, the administrator stated that

some solve their own problems or ask for assistance, other teachers want others to solve the problem for them, still others 'bitch' and complain and do nothing or do not take the suggestions offered.

He also stated that

new programs are implemented from the top down (some are directed by the superintendent's department), others are implemented by discussion, forming committees and studying recommendations.

The staff was introduced to the decision making process only by telling them "why and where (who decided) a decision was made." "Open discussion, forming committees to involve the staff in implementation and bringing in outside personnel" were strategies used. Resources were not always available for new programs but when they were in place, the teachers generally used them.

Eight of the nine teachers responding to the survey were neutral to negative in their response to the questionnaire item "The staff at my school develops new programs." . Eight also indicated that new programs were developed outside the school. One felt that this was almost never the case. The resource teacher felt that no strategies to solve school problems as a staff seemed to be in place--"They complain in the staff room and blame others." She stated that new programs were implemented in the school in both a "top down" and a "bottom up" manner.

The staff feels that a lot is not allowed in this school, when, in reality, it is allowed. They have to be encouraged to express their opinions and share their ideas.

Generally though, the style was described as "top down."

The resource teacher was new to the school but not new to resource work. She had been a resource teacher for seven years and had worked at both the elementary and junior high school levels. She also had nine years of classroom experience at the elementary and junior high school. This year she was working as a resource teacher at both a junior and senior high school. She had not been trained in collaborative consultation during her university resource teacher program but had worked on the Divisional Committee that had developed the resource teacher policy and had attended many intensive workshops on consultation skills.

The teachers saw the school's 200 students as being made up of two distinct populations. The majority of the students came from what teachers described as "upper middle to middle class" homes where many parents were "entrepreneurs or middle class professional." About 30% of the students lived in government subsidized housing for families in need of low cost accommodation or multi-family dwellings such as apartment blocks or condominiums. The resource teacher stated that one parent who lived in the government complex described it as "the ghetto" and complained that these children found it difficult to bring their school friends home because of "drug dealing" and "gang fighting." The school had a transient population. The resource

teacher also stated that there had been five new Low Incidence students at the beginning of the Fall term. Three of these students had left by the spring term. The student body consisted of a majority of "well behaved high achieving students" with a large minority of students having difficulty. About 25% of the students were referred to the resource teacher and many of these had severe learning problems. A large number of the students were enrolled in the gifted program. The administrator stated that "the students in this school scored very highly on divisional tests."

The Resource Program: View of the Resource Teacher

The resource teacher described a resource program that included "referral, file search, conference, observation, testing, diagnostic teaching, conference, on going contact and referral to clinicians if necessary." The majority of referrals (80%) were made by classroom teachers. The amount of school time designated for resource work used for consultation with referring teachers varied according to the time of year. 20 to 25% of this time was estimated as consultation time before Christmas with 10% estimated after Christmas.

Low Incidence students, slow learners and others designated by the principal were timetabled for regular instructional sessions with either the resource teacher or the paraprofessional for about one period per day. Usually the time was taken from French or business education classes. During this time, students were taught learning strategies (resource teacher) or assisted with organization skills, homework and studying (paraprofessional). In addition, teachers were responsible for tutoring students on a regular basis. This teacher tutorial program was planned by the principal and largely administered by the teachers. The teachers selected the students they thought would benefit from tutoring. Although the resource teacher had been asked to plan and monitor these tutorial sessions, she attempted to maintain this responsibility with the principal and teachers as much as possible by asking the teachers to plan their own sessions, and keep their own student files. The principal and teachers had agreed to this suggestion. The resource teacher assumed responsibility for timetabling the tutorials.

Consultation often took place before school started in the morning, during lunch hour and after school. The resource teacher felt that the time used was insufficient and that an inadequate job of consultation was being performed. The reasons given were "heavy caseload--a large number of referrals and since I was new to the school,

all students and teachers were new to me and therefore required more time." When asked what stages of the division's consultation policy were used, the reply was "Whatever I can squeeze in. Evaluation is weak."

Strategies utilized to encourage collaboration with teachers consisted of involving the teachers in the process as much as possible; for example,

diagnosis--they do classroom activities and bring their results and work samples to the educational planning conference. We decide together at the referral conference who will be responsible for what parts of the diagnostic testing/teaching process and what we will evaluate.

Following a more "formal" consultation process such as the one outlined in the Division policy, was also indicated as a collaborative strategy that "should" be in place. Students and parents were also involved in the process whenever possible. The resource teacher stated,

If the teachers don't want to participate in the conferences with the student and parent, that is acceptable, as these meetings all take place outside of school hours. I then ask them for a written progress report and plans are made with the student and the parents to implement change at home or in work habits and/or behavior at school. I give everyone a copy of our 'contract' and this usually results in some improvement in behavior or work in the classroom. I've found that the teachers then become more encouraged and gradually they participate more. They also then perceive me as 'working' as I meet monthly with parents of students who require this constant feedback. This image is important at the secondary level, as classroom teachers often perceive teachers without classrooms as not working as hard as they do. It also puts a little pressure on the teachers because they are now 'forced' to work with the parents to some extent and feel more accountable to them.

Strategies employed to encourage communication between the resource teacher and the referring teacher consisted of "smiling, a sense of humour and trying to present an image of self confidence and knowledgeability." Conflict was handled by "staying calm, being firm about expectations, putting plans in writing with the teacher's signature, and, as a last resort, informing the administrator and leaving the problem to him."

The resource teacher felt that her ability to handle conflict was weak because it was difficult to confront staff on sensitive issues. She stated, "it could be better."

I am concerned about my own survival and it depends on positive staff relations so I approach confrontation with caution. I have to be sensitive to the teachers and the political situation. One teacher told me I was 'quiet and low key but always there' I think she meant that she felt I was checking on progress. This is pretty informal. Another has told me that I use a 'non-combative' strategy.

The amount of change expected of the teacher during the referral process was controlled by varying the expectations to the teacher:

Sometimes I take more than half of the responsibility; sometimes no change is required and the teacher takes all the responsibility for the program. I just assist with writing the modifications and monitor progress. If the teacher is uncooperative and without any reasonable reason to be so, I usually withdraw and either work with the parents or just inform the administrator and leave the situation to him. Sometimes the student will be removed from the class. If there is a reason why the teachers won't/can't cooperate, I try to help them as much as possible. This is where I might take more than my share of the workload.

The resource teacher described the teachers' attitudes towards the changes embedded in the consultative collaborative approach to resource teacher services as positive. "At first it appeared negative, but, for the most part, it is, in reality, quite positive." Teachers' attitude to mainstreaming was described as mixed. "Some are positive and some are negative; on the whole, it is average to very good. It has changed a lot this year." Their attitudes to program modification and consultation are also mixed. "Some do; some don't. One of these is a first year teacher with heavy extracurricular demands."

Resources were sometimes provided for new programs but not for the resource program or program modification. "Few good tests or materials were in the resource room when I came. The resource budget was \$100 per year. Time was extremely scarce this year." Most of the time the teachers used the resources when they were provided. Although the resource program had not been a priority in the school, this was changing. Plans for the following year included increasing resource time from half time to full time.

The Resource Program: Views of the Administrator and the Teachers

The principal described a resource program which used the stages of referral, resource teacher meeting with the student, diagnostic testing, the resource teacher

making recommendations to the classroom teacher, and the teachers modifying programs. In addition, slow learning and previously identified low incidence students received direct service. The classroom teacher received information about these students from the resource teacher and the teachers consulted with the resource teacher. He indicated that the divisional model had been modified to "make it work in our school. Consultation time was described as a small part of the program. In his view, about 10 to 15% of the resource teacher's time was spent consulting.

Nine of the 13 teachers in this school who were sent questionnaires responded. Eight of the respondents indicated that they had students on individualized programs. The number of students designated ranged from one to seven per teacher. The teachers reported from one to seventeen students in their classes who risked failing grades. All teachers but one indicated that they had referred students to the resource teacher this year. The teacher who had not referred any students this year, stated that the students from those classes that were seen by the resource teacher had been identified as requiring resource service in previous years. All teachers had discussed students informally with the resource teacher. Five respondents indicated that "four to five" students had been discussed in this fashion. In response to the questionnaire item on resource teacher use, two indicated that they used the service as much as they could and five used the resource teacher a great deal but not as much as they could. Five teachers stated that they referred all students at risk.

The responses of the teachers in this school showed that many different approaches were taken to deliver resource teacher services. One of the teachers indicated these resource services were tutorial without any consultation. Three thought the services were tutorial with a minor consultation component. Two described the program as tutorial with informal consultation. A formal consultative program which followed the Divisional policy was selected by three of the respondents. Two of these, selected the "consultation with additional learning strategy instruction" item. One teacher selected more than one "model" and one did not respond. When asked to describe the program, some teachers described teacher tutorial time, "Parental contact for resource obtained, Testing, Resource time allotted, Tutorial time added."; or a resource teacher tutorial program "Teacher gives referral, Resource teacher analysis of student situation, Resource sets up timetable for student, Student takes resource time." and others described a consultative

approach, "Does a 'cum' file search, Speaks to referring teacher re: student, Does diagnostic testing and observes student, Discusses results with referring teacher and parents, Develops an IEP with the teacher, Implements the plan." Another described neither situation, "Testing and meeting: if no problems, then tutorial or end of case; if problems, then funding requests, scheduling for resource, meeting with involved teachers, request from parents for help, strategies to overcome problems, guidance help if necessary."

It seems that these responses do not reflect the resource teacher's program alone, but also include the other tutorial programs in the school. These may be perceived to be part of the resource program. However, the resource teacher herself was not pleased with the amount of time she spent consulting with classroom teachers and the principal stated that the "teaming" approach of the collaborative consultative model was new to the staff.

Seven respondents answered the questionnaire item asking for a description of the steps the resource teacher follows when receiving a new referral. Of the consultation stages listed in the Divisional policy, the stage consistently indicated by the teachers as being used by the resource teacher was diagnosis. The educational planning conference was indicated by six respondents and referral conference and implementation were indicated by three respondents. Evaluation was never indicated. This is consistent with the resource teacher responses. She stated that she used whatever stages she could fit into the scarce time and that evaluation was weak.

When asked to describe the referral conference, four of the teachers selected the response "the resource teacher asked me what I thought the problem was." and four of the teachers selected, "The resource teacher asked me what I thought the problem was and then added some of her own ideas." In response to the item questioning data collection plans, four indicated the resource teacher made the decision on the method of diagnosis and four indicated that the resource teacher and classroom teacher made the decisions together. Data collection was described as being completed by the resource teacher alone half of the time; in the other half of the cases it was described as being completed by the resource teacher and classroom teacher together, sometimes with the inclusion of clinicians. Comments indicated that this varied with the student and was dependent on student needs. Five of the respondents indicated that plans were most often developed together through negotiation and discussion. Only one respondent indicated that the resource teacher

developed a plan alone. Three of the respondents indicated that conflict or disagreement occurred and all of these indicated that it was open and resolved. Communication was described as "open and two-way" by seven of the respondents. Seven indicated that plans were implemented with "our responsibilities determined by discussion and agreement and were designed to suit our individual strengths and roles." Evaluation was indicated to be completed by both the resource teacher and the classroom teacher by four of the respondents and completed by the classroom teacher alone by three of the respondents. One selected both responses and one indicated that no one evaluated. These responses indicate a high use of collaboration.

The administrator described the teachers' attitude to resource and consultation as "the most positive they have ever been and getting better. They are buying into a team approach." The first year the principal was in the school, the resource teacher

was authoritarian, not a lot of consultation occurred and the staff was unsupportive. The second year, a new resource teacher was in the school. He had a different philosophy and a looser structure. The referrals were heavy and not a lot of direct assistance was given. The third year another new resource teacher came to the school. She was concerned about 'all' kids, proper diagnosis, proper assistance, made time commitments and followed them and followed up recommendations.

Five of the the questionnaire respondents were very enthusiastic about implementing new programs. Only one replied negatively and the remainder were neutral to positive. Six thought individualization was effective. One saw it as ineffective. Only two of the respondents felt that they were knowledgeable about individualizing instruction for special education students.

In response to a questionnaire item asking for an indication of the teachers' attitude to mainstreaming, only one teacher indicated a neutral stance. Four of the respondents were negative and the remainder were very positive. However, only one felt that mainstreaming was effective. Five of the respondents had a neutral attitude and the remainder were negative. Five of the teachers felt that separate special education classes were more effective and the remainder were neutral in their opinion, not indicating which situation was more effective. Even though a large number of teachers indicated that they were very positive in their attitude to mainstreaming, it appears that they did not really believe it worked.

The resource teacher in this school demonstrated an understanding of the collaborative consultative process and indicated a desire to more closely follow the divisional model. It seems that the heavy caseload and her part-time status made it difficult to accomplish the entire process. This confirms the premise of Conoley and Conoley (1982) that certain conditions might signal no entry or a discontinuation of consultation services. The condition indicated at this school was the large caseload and the need for direct service.

In spite of the time constraints, the resource teacher attempted to implement as many stages of consultation as she could and seemed to make some progress in initiating change in the classroom. In addition, she accomplished her goal of relieving the time constraints by convincing the staff to have a full time resource teacher the following year. This decision resulted in the discontinuation of the teacher tutorial program which caused the teachers to spend more of their day in the classroom, and, in a small school, could cause teachers to increase the number of subjects or grades taught. In spite of this, the teachers were supportive of the change. The administrator also seems to have changed his opinion of resource teacher programs and appears to see the benefit of collaboration. This accomplishment seems to indicate that the consultant can influence the school to change so that the consultative role can be more effectively implemented. It also demonstrates the importance of supports to the consultative role, and may indicate that the strategy of working towards the implementation of these supports should be the initial priority of the consultant.

This resource teacher also consistently involved the students and parents in the consultation process and worked towards developing good work habits and study skills. She attempted to develop a sense of student responsibility for homework completion and studying at home while showing the student how to accomplish this task. She involved the parents in developing behaviour plans at home. This assistance was appreciated by the teachers, was seen to be effective by the staff and parents, involved meeting with parents outside of school hours and was probably an example of what Sarason describes as "giving." Sarason (1972) states that it is rare for teachers to experience "getting" and that this experience makes the acceptance of a consultant more likely. In addition, the parents had met with the principal to express their support of this type of assistance and this feedback may have also influenced the administrator's decision to increase resource time. This study did not investigate the

factors of student and parent involvement in the consultative process. It appears that these are very important factors.

Case Study Two: Dr. Darrell Junior High

Dr. Darrell Junior High is larger than Commason, but still considered to be a small school. It provides an interesting contrast to Commason because both schools have teacher tutorial programs, are small and resource programs seem to be a low priority. Whereas, the administrator at Commason has decided to eliminate the teacher tutorial program at Commason next year and increase resource time, the administrator at Dr. Darrell has not. The resource teacher at Dr. Darrell assumes more responsibility for the teacher tutorial program than the resource teacher at Commason. Almost no consultation appears to take place at Dr. Darrell. The differences seem to be credited to the principal, but may be largely due to staff. The staff has been at this school for a long time. The resource teacher commented that they listen politely to the principal but do what they please. The staff attitude toward mainstreaming is negative as it is towards program modification. The administrator supports this attitude. This school best shows the lack of influence a resource teacher may have on the resource program even though good use is made of collaboration.

The School

Dr. Darrell Junior High has a teaching staff of 14. At the time the data for this study were collected, two teachers taught in the school on a part time basis. One was the resource teacher and one was the guidance counsellor. The guidance counsellor was at the school 50% of the time and worked all day on alternate days of the six day cycle. The resource teacher had worked at the school 69% of the time before Christmas and 73% of the time after Christmas. This adjustment was made in response to an increase in Low Incidence funding. There were no paraprofessionals in the school.

Most of the teachers taught two or more subjects. Only two teachers were new to the school this year. The staff at this school had been together for a long time and was described by the principal as having a "high commitment to professional development." This was the administrator's third year in the school.

The resource teacher felt that when the staff confronted school problems they usually "talked about things. In the end it's the way he (principal) wants it to be. This

is not generally a problem as the staff has been here a long time." When new programs were implemented in the school, they were implemented in a

'top down' manner. The school philosophy is his idea. First there's P-R with the teachers; the reasons why we are to implement this program are presented. The incentive is to save jobs. Then a professional development committee is formed to develop inservice. The principal is a delegator.

The administrator indicated that the staff solved problems together--"We're in it together. Our problem, therefore our solution. Problems are solved informally in the staff room and formally at staff meetings." New programs were developed by the staff from a perceived need. He stated that the staff was receptive to change and that change was encouraged "at staff meetings, by professional development activities, committee work, talking to teachers and delegating a lot." The staff who responded to the questionnaire expressed positive attitudes toward professional development. They agreed that new programs were developed within the school.

The resource teacher had worked in the school on a part time basis for five years. This had been her only resource position and her only position in this school division. She had taught a special education class in another school division previously.

The school's 225 students came from what the administrator described as "middle and upper middle class homes." He described the school as having a "reputation for excellence" and this phrase was used as the school logo. Because of this good reputation, 35 students came from outside the school catchment area. This school initiated a segregated program for gifted students to encourage increased student numbers. The purpose was to prepare students for the International Baccalaureate program at the high school level.

The Resource Program: View of the Resource Teacher

When asked to describe the resource program at Dr. Darrell, the resource teacher outlined a program that included

administering tests and analyzing test scores in the Fall to construct class profiles, discussing this data with the teachers, adding this information to the list, then forming groups and timetabling students for tutorial instruction. I take the 'level ones' and the 'slow learners' and the other students attend teacher tutorials. The rest of the time I pull in

students who are needy in specific areas. I group by needs and availability. I design programs for needy kids, for example, Math and Spelling and I plan and administer the teacher tutorials. There have been up to 19 of these this year. This takes a lot of time.

Classroom teachers conduct the teacher tutorials during regularly scheduled periods and the resource teacher plans the program for the teachers, monitors the program and monitors the student's progress. Formal consultation was not used because of heavy demands on teachers' time. "The teachers are given the information and 'they' decide how they will modify their program." The resource teacher described the following stages of consultation. "The student is referred from the teacher, testing, no observation (its not relevant as kids behave differently in different classes), do a plan, talk to teachers, pull students, teachers give me work to work on."

Strategies used to encourage collaboration between the resource and classroom teachers were "tried very hard to get along with the staff. I stayed for lunch, etc., I'm not judgmental and I'm approachable." To facilitate communication, the resource teacher stated, "I try to be supportive-- they are the experts; be careful not to step on their toes." Conflict was handled by talking about it. The resource teacher said that it was not a real problem. She thought that her ability to handle conflict was weak because her ability to confront staff on sensitive issues was "something I'd like to work on. I think in some cases I should be more assertive than I am. This is 'my' problem. It depends how much I believe in it."

The amount of change expected from teachers in modifying programs was controlled by "going slow." The resource teacher described the teachers' attitudes towards these changes as good. Their attitude to resource/consultation/mainstreaming/individualizing programs was described as "varied." When asked if resources were available for new programs, the response was

Yes, if the principal sees it as valuable. Resources for modifying programs are not available. He leaves it up to me to do the best with what I have. He's not resource program oriented.

Teachers sometimes use these resources. Incentives were available for program implementation and were described as "keeping their job. Either you support the program or you leave." There were no incentives to consult with the resource teacher.

The Resource Program: Views of the Administrator and the Teachers

The principal described a resource program which was, in his view, largely "pull-out and a good deal of time on tutorial with some program modification." He explained this approach by stating that "the Department of Education's Low Incidence Model demanded one to one instruction" and that "the staff was flexible to either approach." The principal didn't know how much time the resource teacher spent consulting with classroom teachers and stated that he "had no trouble with consultation time as long as it's consultation time. My resource teacher works hard and I have no worry."

Only three of the 12 teachers in the school who received questionnaires responded. Because the return rate of the questionnaires was low, it is difficult to determine if these responses reflect the situation with most teachers. All of the classroom teachers who responded to the questionnaire selected a remedial tutorial model of resource service delivery combined with informal discussion of the program on an on-going basis. They described the program in the following ways:

"Meets with teacher, meets with student, sets up program and re-meets with teacher and parents."

"Meets with teacher to discuss student, sets up a schedule and a remedial program."

"Tests, prescribes suitable material for the student to use, evaluates that student's progress on an on-going basis."

Only one respondent indicated that students in their classes were on individualized programs; all three respondents referred students to the resource teacher this year. Two respondents had discussed students informally with the resource teacher. Two stated that they used the resource service as much as they could even though not all students at risk of failing were referred.

When asked to select a description of the referral conference, all respondents selected the response "the resource teacher asked me what I thought the problem was and then added some of her own ideas." All indicated that the method of diagnosis was decided upon together. Everyone selected "The resource teacher did." when asked to indicate who gathered the diagnostic information. Two indicated that an educational plan was developed through negotiation and discussion. Two indicated

that no conflict or disagreement occurred. All indicated that communication was open and two way and two indicated that when the plan was implemented, responsibilities were determined by discussion and agreement. Two stated that the resource teacher evaluated the program. The descriptions of the resource program do not seem to indicate that classroom educational planning often occurs. When it does, it seems that some collaboration is part of the process.

The administrator described the teachers' attitude towards resource and consultation as good and stated that individualizing student programs was no problem. However, he stated that the staff was not very positive about mainstreaming. The staff responses to the items on mainstreaming were varied. Even those that were supportive of the concept, did not feel that it was effective. Two felt that separate special education classes were more effective. All felt that they did not have enough time to individualize programs for students.

The administrator indicated that incentives to implement change were "praise, pat on the back, extra spare." There were no incentives to consult with the resource teacher.

Although this school was very similar to Commason Junior High in size and the creation of a teacher tutorial program, the resource programs were very different. The resource teacher at Dr. Darrell seemed to accommodate the teacher tutorial program by taking the responsibility of designing the student programs for the classroom teachers and completing timetables and reports on the students involved. She initiated the resource program by searching results of standardized tests for students who had performed poorly. Teachers frequently did not request this assistance. The program appeared to be tutorial. In contrast, at Commason, the teacher tutorial program was designed by the teachers conducting the program and the record keeping was also completed by the classroom teachers involved. The majority of students involved in the resource program were referred by the teachers.

The administrator did not seem to support mainstreaming or to encourage consultation and the teachers did not seem to be interested in modifying programs. When consultation did occur, the resource teacher seemed to use collaboration effectively but did not follow the stages of formal consultation. Similar to Commason, conditions within the school do not appear to support collaborative consultation. While resource time had been increased at Dr. Darrell, this did not seem to positively

affect consultation. It appears that the resource teacher had adapted to the school conditions rather than changing them. The result seems to be a tutorial resource program that is operating independently of the regular school program.

Case Study Three: Anacreon Junior High

Anacreon Junior High is a larger school than Commason and Dr. Darrell and has more resource staffing. It is interesting because it is another excellent illustration of the effect of the administrator and staff on the resource program. The administrators placed a high priority on extra or co-curricular activities and public relations. During the interviews the administrators stopped to point out extracurricular groups in the school, to pay attention to the band group practising and to show me the written documentation of all phone calls received from parents and all students referred to the office. One administrator seemed to equate professional development with involvement in extracurricular activities.

At this school the resource teachers followed all the stages and documented their work well. The peer tutoring program was large and conducted primarily outside of school hours as an extracurricular activity. The teachers were young and seemed to enjoy the heavy extracurricular demands yet were described by one of the resource teachers as reluctant to meet with the resource staff. Little use of collaboration was in evidence. The resource teachers at this school expressed the most frustration with their role.

The School

Anacreon Junior High has a teaching staff of 32. Approximately 30% of the teachers had come to the school within the last two years and most of these were new to teaching. This school was a dual track immersion school and most of the new teachers taught in a second language. Extracurricular programs were numerous and the new teachers could be expected to experience many lesson preparation demands.

Because the two programs separated the school, the teachers were required to teach more than one subject area. However, there were enough students to warrant specialists in band, language arts, home economics and industrial arts.

The administrators described a staff with varying attitudes and seemed to disagree in their responses. One administrator stated that the staff solved problems

by "passing it on to the administrator to decide", another stated the the staff used a "collegial approach and didn't run to the administrator." The teachers may use a different approach with each administrator. Programs were developed by the staff and the administrator according to needs. "The administrator seeks teachers who are interested and encourages their interest in a new program." One administrator said the staff had a low commitment to professional development because of high involvement in extracurricular activities. The other administrator stated that the staff had a high commitment to professional development,

high--many are young and in the learning mode. The teachers want to do a lot with kids outside of school. There are always teachers and kids around. The teachers work together helping each other.

Perhaps there is confusion between professional development and spending one's own time on school tasks.

The resource teachers described the teachers' attitude to change as "varied" or,

Most people are fairly open. It differs--some are more accepting than others. and, "reluctant--feeling of mistrust."

According to the resource teachers, no staff problem solving strategies were in place. Problems were usually discussed informally at staff meetings. New programs were implemented in a "top down" manner.

Directives--you do it--no choice. Teacher initiative to change is minor.

Directives come from the Board. He is a 'by the book' principal.

When change is implemented it is discussed at staff meetings. Some staff members are encouraged to be involved and he hopes that the others will follow. He's reluctant to tell people to change--he invites it.

In the school there were 2.75 resource positions shared by three people. One resource teacher worked in the resource area on a full time basis and the other two also had classroom responsibilities. All of the resource teachers were in the school full time. The full time resource teacher had worked in the school as a resource teacher for five years and had been trained in the collaborative consultative resource model at university. This was her first resource position and she had been hired for this function. She had worked as a classroom teacher in other school divisions in the

past. One part time resource teacher had worked as an elementary resource teacher for six years before coming to the junior high school. Previous to resource teaching, she had worked as an elementary classroom teacher. This was her first year as a junior high school teacher. The other part time resource teacher worked in the area of second language instruction both in the classroom and in the resource room. This resource teacher had one year of classroom experience, no previous resource experience and no training in resource teacher programs.

Although the school population of 460 students could be considered to be large, the effect of the second language immersion program was to separate the school into two small schools. The students in the second language program came from all areas of the school division by bus and were generally considered to be excellent students with few academic problems. If severe problems were encountered, it seemed that often the solution was to remove them from the language program. The part time second language resource teacher was responsible for working with the students in this program who encountered difficulty. The regular school program consisted of students from the area around the school which was largely "middle class." Some of the students lived in housing provided for members of the Canadian Armed Forces and consequently, these students had attended many different schools in Canada and Abroad.

One administrator saw the school priorities as "academic and the development of students' self discipline." The other saw the school priorities as "Band and Choral programs, late entry immersion program, computer (past), extracurricular programs, the teachers' needs, my needs are last". The resource teachers mentioned Physical Education, extracurricular activities, sports and French. Teachers of Band and those with heavy extracurricular responsibility were given extra preparation time.

The Resource Program: Views of the Resource Teachers

The veteran resource teacher described a resource program that was based on teacher referral,

Ownership is a priority. If the teacher doesn't refer a student who requires assistance, I send the administrator to the teacher. Once the referral is received, tracers are sent to all of the student's teachers. Then the student's cumulative file is checked and I meet with the classroom teacher. The next step is classroom observation. If the classroom teacher does not allow me to observe in the classroom, the

referral doesn't proceed. At this point in the process the student doesn't know about the referral. After the observation is complete, the parents and the student are contacted. I request the student's permission to proceed. I then do an assessment and diagnostic teaching. The diagnostic teaching is not as precise as in data-based teaching as I find that the gap is too large at the junior high school level. After this is complete, I conference with the teacher and arrange some sort of tutorial program. I use parent volunteers or peer tutors. In addition, we discuss classroom modifications. This is where the program breaks down. The educational planning conference is based on the results of the diagnostic teaching and experience. I find that the teachers don't want collaboration, they want a plan. Therefore they choose from a number of suggestions. The plan is signed and copies are sent to the teachers. A follow-up conference is scheduled and the teacher evaluates the plan. Sometimes the evaluation is precise and sometimes it is not.

The other resource teachers described similar service delivery.

When I receive a referral I contact the teacher and clarify it. I have an initial interview with the student to establish rapport. I make appointments for the diagnosis. I provide feedback to the referring teacher and we develop a plan from there. I write up the plan after the fact and the plan is monitored. Follow-up is ongoing and consists of an informal meeting. If the students are performing adequately in class, I close the case. My students tend to be long term cases.

When I receive a referral, I check the cumulative folder for background data. Then I consult with the referring teacher. I contact the parents and I proceed with diagnostic testing. I develop a hypothesis first and then I develop a plan. I collect the materials and set up a program. In the immersion program no materials exist. The curriculum is not helpful and the teachers are new. They appreciate anything I can develop. I meet with the teacher and then I conduct diagnostic teaching. I may retest or change the plan during this process. I meet with the teacher again for an evaluation conference. I also provide a test to the student after intervention. I try to maintain the Division model. When I meet with the teachers I have an agenda for the meeting. It helps me to be organized. I also record the meeting.

Two of the resource teachers indicated that they used about 10% of the time designated for resource work for consultation; the other one was not sure how much time was used. All felt that it was not sufficient. One felt that the reason sufficient time was not available was because the Division didn't see it as a priority.

Consultation time is not part of the timetable but must be on your 'own' time. The Low Incidence students and slow learners require continuous support and too many teachers are responsible for their

programs. There is a tremendous need for time. I tried forcing the issue and the result was that the teachers were too upset over the demands for consultation. They went to the Provincial Teacher's Society and complained about the pressure I put on them. As a result, I resort to 'catching' them while they're doing other things. In the junior high there are a number of different teachers for each student. Two years ago I was the only resource teacher and I had 13 Level One students. The administration is supportive but won't timetable consultation time because it would mean removing a preparation period for the teachers.

The others stated that it was insufficient because of the scheduling of the teachers.

I also have classroom duties. The teachers won't give up their lunch hours or their preparation periods. They would rather see me at 8:15 A.M.

My time is heavily booked giving direct service to Level One students and I teach in the classroom. My preparation periods don't coincide with the teachers' preparation periods. At lunch time I supervise peer tutors and I have regularly scheduled lunch duty like the rest of the teachers. There is coaching after school. There are many demands on the teachers and they need breaks so they can focus on other things. Consultation is done 'on the run'. It needs to become part of the job of educators. I wish to see consultation time built into the timetable.

In addition to frustrations with the inadequacy of consultation time, the resource teachers expressed other frustrations with the process.

We need to work on getting teachers to understand what the students' problems are and to understand modification. We need to get back to teaching and set priorities. We lose a lot of time for other things such as extracurricular, sports, games, rehearsals, French Group, etc.

The parents of the immersion students have rejected the regular school system and are a more militant elitist group. They expect more from the teachers and there is a high turnover rate of students.

More preparation time is needed at the junior high school level. The high school teachers get more than we do and they don't have the discipline problems to deal with that we must handle. There is more stress at the junior high level and the teachers need a break.

The students lack basic skills and the other programs such as band, art, thinking skills, etc, take time from English.

Prospective changes need to be discussed from the start when students are referred to resource. A good question to ask teachers, parents and students is 'If need be, are you willing to make adaptations or changes?'

When asked to indicate the strategies they used to keep the relationship with the classroom teacher a collaborative one, the resource teachers replied,

I always try and indicate support and understanding of classroom demands. Getting the teacher involved in the dialogue is important. Teachers will often solve their own problems just by talking. When I review the diagnosis and diagnostic teaching I give the teacher an opportunity to respond. I make suggestions. Either the teacher supports them or doesn't. I keep notes.

This is difficult because of lack of resources. I take advantage of the peer tutoring program. I share findings in files with teachers as well as reactions of parents. I propose diagnostic teaching ideas and ask their opinion. I feel that the responsibility lies with the teacher. This is not always working well.

I let the teachers know I respect them and their suggestions by giving comments on teaching techniques that they are using that are suitable. Formerly I dominated. My experience is that they (teachers) want an 'expert' role. Teachers don't seem to understand what the students don't understand. There are many pressures on them and course demands.

To facilitate communication, the resource teachers "tried to make the teachers feel involved, tried to show that they didn't have all the answers", "smiled a lot, shared concerns and frustrations, offered to meet them half way and supported them with parents."

The resource teachers modified the rate of change expected from the teachers by

spending the first year getting to know the teachers and not asking a lot during that year so that I can understand their capabilities.

taking small steps, a little at a time. I'm sensitive to the demands placed on teachers.

not controlling change, I'm frustrated by the teachers' slowness.

The staff's attitude towards consultation/resource/program modification/mainstreaming was described as

positive at the possibility; negative towards the reality because of the time commitment.

not happy about mainstreaming and the attempt of the administration to cut funding

they find it highly stressful--too many demands and not enough time.

The resource teachers were aware of no incentives for change or to participate in a consultative resource program.

The Resource Program: Views of the Administrators and Teachers

The principals described a resource program with a large tutorial component. They explained that this tutorial was needed and that by using peer tutors and parents volunteers, more students could be served. In addition, they felt that the divisional collaborative consultation policy was being followed. "The resource teachers don't just accept the teacher's idea of the problem--the model is rich." Specific descriptions included,

referral, background development--looking for possibilities, diagnosis, action plan, parent contact, widespread use of peer tutors and parent volunteers, follow-up and accountability.

students are referred by teachers to the resource teachers, testing, work one on one, use volunteers and peer tutors, meet with the other resource teachers and guidance counsellor once a cycle to discuss students, meet with clinicians once every six weeks.

The amount of time resource teachers spent consulting was estimated at "10% of their allotted resource time" and "30 minutes per day." One administrator stated that the resource teachers were "always busy--mostly with kids". Consultation was described as being "a lot of informal discussion." Both administrators said that consultation was necessary and desirable and that they would like to have more but that the teachers didn't have enough time.

Four of the 27 teachers who received the questionnaire responded. Because of this limited return, it is again difficult to determine if these responses truly reflect the resource program in this school. Three of the respondents indicated that they had one or no students on individualized programs. All four had referred students to the resource teacher. All respondents indicated that they had students in their classes who had failing grades (from 4 to 9 students per teacher) and all reported discussing

students informally with the resource teacher (from 10 to 15 per teacher). None of the respondents knew if students in their classes had been referred to the resource teachers by another teacher. Half of the respondents stated that they used the resource teacher service as much as they could. Only one of the respondents referred all students who risked failure to the resource teacher.

The responses of the teachers seemed to describe a tutorial resource program with informal consultation that followed many of the stages outlined in the divisional policy.

First she interviews the teacher, observes in the classroom, sees the student, tests the student, sets up a new program.

Asks certain questions of all subject teachers on paper, reads our responses, diagnostic testing and analysis, plans an appropriate program over a period of time, final evaluation after period is over, completes a report on progress including future recommendations.

Approaches me to discuss informally, arranges time to observe the student in class, discussed observations with me and talks about strategies, meets with the student, remedial work or behavior modification program begins, regular follow-up.

When asked to select a description that most closely resembled the resource program in their school, all of the respondents selected a collaborative consultative resource model. Half of the respondents chose the description that also included learning strategy instruction in the resource room. There seems to be a discrepancy between the written descriptions of resource service delivery, and the choice of a resource model from a listing of different service delivery models. It was unclear from the descriptions if the programs that were developed were conducted by the classroom teacher, the resource teacher or peer tutors/parent volunteers. The amount of teacher/resource teacher collaboration was also unclear. The lack of time to consult and the expressed frustration of the resource teachers as well as their feeling that the service delivery broke down at the program modification stage, seems to indicate that classroom program modification does not regularly occur. The consultation component seems to vary in depth with the willingness of the teacher to participate. One teacher commented, "I have come to depend on the resource department at this school, as the staff employed there is exceptionally efficient, understanding and professional." The consistency of follow-up was mentioned by both the administrator and the classroom teachers.

When asked to describe the referral conference, three of the respondents selected the response "The resource teacher asked me what I thought the problem was and then added some of her own ideas." All respondents agreed that the resource teacher decided on the method of diagnosis. Three stated that the resource teacher gathered the diagnostic information alone. Three stated that the resource teacher developed the educational plan alone or that the resource teacher made only suggestions and the teacher developed the plan alone. Only one of the respondents indicated collaboration occurred during the educational planning. All stated that no conflict or disagreement occurred. Three agreed that communication was open and two-way. Three stated that when the plan was implemented, roles and responsibilities were determined by discussion. Half of the respondents indicated that the resource teacher evaluated the plan and half indicated that the plan was evaluated by both the resource and classroom teachers. These responses indicate that collaboration is not a major component of the school's service delivery. One teacher commented that this may happen because of the resource teacher's concern for the teacher's demanding time commitments. The resource teacher has stated that the teachers do not wish to collaborate but prefer an "expert."

The administrators described the teachers' attitude towards resource/consultation as "good." Their attitude towards modifying programs was described as "accepting it but not liking it" and their attitude towards mainstreaming was "negative. They would like a return to special education." The teachers were slightly positive to slightly negative in indicating support for the concept of mainstreaming. They were neutral to negative in feeling mainstreaming was effective and all were positive in feeling that special education classes were effective. Three were unsure if individualization or modification of students' programs was effective. All agreed that they did not have sufficient time to modify student programs.

Time as a resource was difficult to provide but was available. Extra preparation time was used as an incentive. Incentives to participate in the resource program were to "ask teachers, 'Have you referred this student?' " and to "sing the praises of the resource teacher."

The resource program at this school seemed to best follow the stages of formal consultation. However, the use of collaboration was not always demonstrated. The resource teacher stated that the teachers seemed to want an "expert" role and that

program modifications were developed by the resource teacher compiling a list of suggestions and the classroom teacher selecting the ones they would use, rather than by the use of negotiation and discussion. The resource teacher stated that the program was experiencing difficulty with implementation. In addition, the resource teachers expressed frustration with the lack of consultation time. They seemed to indicate that they would like the administrator to provide this time in some way. Insistence with consulting during the teachers' preparation time had met with resistance by the staff.

Although the administrator applauded the resource program in this school, he was hesitant to insist on the removal of teacher preparation time for consultation. The resource teachers stated that the teachers' workload was very heavy, and this may account for the administrator's decision to not remove preparation time. By using this time, the teachers may have felt that they were to "give" more rather than "get". Sarason (1972) has stated that teachers are expected to "give" without experiencing "getting". The resource teachers may have been more successful if they had been able to find a way to relieve some of this workload in some way.

However, the resource teachers were also heavily involved in the school programs. Two were also classroom teachers and student supervision and the school peer tutoring program consumed much of their out of class time. The administrator's priority was the provision of extracurricular programs and this priority extended to the resource program as well. This school had the largest peer tutoring program in the Division as well as a large parent volunteer program. Tutoring was provided by these peer tutors and volunteers. It seems as though the resource program has adapted to the school conditions and the administrator expectations. The provision of consultation time in addition to preparation time seems to be essential for the success of a consultative resource teacher program when demands on teachers are heavy.

Case Study Four: Bayata Junior High

Bayata Junior High is also a large school and one of two schools in this study with a segregated special education class. This school best illustrates the positive effects of an administrator who places a priority on the resource program as well as the effects of a good consultation program combined with an open staff who have a high commitment to professional development.

The resource teachers in this school spend the most time consulting and are the happiest with their programs. Two different resource teacher programs are in operation. The questionnaire return rate was low and it is difficult to differentiate between these two programs. It seems that the consulting resource teacher program which does not mandate observation and consultation on the timetable is more successful than the Low Incidence resource program which does require this. Some of the completed questionnaires seemed to indicate a lack of collaboration. Yet informal "one-legged" consultation was in evidence during my interview as well as formal consultation. The resource teachers spend a great deal of after school hours consulting with teachers at the teacher's request.

The staff is not totally supportive of program modification and is negative towards mainstreaming. It is questionable how much program modification takes place. However, this staff is very open and the resource teachers find it easy to confront staff. The responses at this school may be the most honest. The staff does have a high commitment to professional development and seem to have a good self concept as teachers.

The School

Bayata Junior High School has a teaching staff of 26.3 positions filled by 30 teachers. Only one teacher was new to teaching but 7 were new to the school this year. These teachers were senior staff who transferred to the school because of declining enrollments in other divisional schools. Both the principal and the vice-principal were new to the school. The principal had been transferred from another Divisional school and the vice-principal was new to this position.

The school had two full time resource teachers and one paraprofessional as well as a full time guidance counsellor. The paraprofessional was to assist with the mainstreaming of a blind student. One resource teacher was designated as a Low Incidence resource teacher and she provided tutorial service to Low Incidence students and assisted the classroom teachers who had these students in their classes. She was timetabled to team teach with the classroom teachers at least once a cycle and consultation time was also timetabled with these teachers once per cycle. She was a very experienced special education teacher who had taught a segregated class of slow learning and severely learning disabled adolescents for many years

before becoming a resource teacher. The other resource teacher was to follow Divisional policy and use a collaborative consultative approach. She had worked as a classroom and resource teacher at both the elementary and junior high school levels. These resource program plans had been made by the previous principal. The two resource teachers had worked together for 3 years in this manner and they stated that they worked well together as a team.

Because the staff was large, they were able to specialize in one subject area much more often than in the other schools. The staff was experienced and had a reputation of "working hard and playing hard." They got along together very well in and outside of school. Both the principal and the vice-principal commented on this and stated that this school staff had had this reputation for a number of years. The vice-principal had worked in the school as a teacher a number of years before and was surprised to find that the school personality had not changed even though the staff had changed a great deal. One administrator described the staff's problem solving techniques as,

bull in a china shop. They confront others, blame others then work out solutions. There is a full range of personalities and the problems get solved. The staff works well together. This attitude has been maintained even though 70% of the staff has changed since I was last here. The new people seem to be assimilated.

Both described the staff as having a high commitment to professional development. The resource teachers described the staff as "open, no cliques, we talk at staff meetings and over coffee. Everyone speaks out and they confront each other. We all get along and are very amenable." To solve problems "we brainstorm, share ideas and involve other professionals and parents." They also described the staff as having a high commitment to professional development.

The students were largely "middle class" but the school had its share of problem students too. These students primarily came from outside the school catchment area and were placed in a special class for behaviorally disordered adolescents. This class was small and the teacher was assisted by a full time paraprofessional. When these students were ready to return to a regular class, they were introduced slowly one class at a time at this school before they returned to their regular school. The special class teacher, resource teacher, guidance counsellor and paraprofessional assisted the regular class teacher with programming and behavior

management. The principal commented that these students caused a great deal of extra work for him and caused many problems outside of class. During our interview, he left to ask some high school students to leave the building. He explained that they had been coming to collect an outstanding debt for drugs from one of the "special ed." students. He didn't like to have this type of student in the building causing problems for the "good academic students" who were not discipline problems.

In addition, two second language programs were offered to attract more students to the school.

Both resource teachers and administrators stated that new programs were implemented in a "top down" manner from the central administration. One administrator stated that programs were also implemented from the "bottom up" according to school need. The questionnaire respondents agreed that new programs were implemented from both outside and inside the school. All agreed that the staff was open to problem solving.

Half of the respondents thought that the resource program was a school priority and half thought extracurricular activities were a school priority. The administrators agreed that mathematics, language arts, and computers were school priorities.

The Resource Program: View of the Resource Teachers

Two resource programs existed in this school. The Low Incidence resource teacher was in charge of nineteen severely learning disabled and slow learning students. These types of students were mainstreamed in regular classes in all schools, but only this school separated the role of the resource teachers to distinguish between these students and other students encountering difficulty. These identified students qualified for a grant from the Department of Education which the division used to hire additional resource teachers. It was expected that these students would receive direct tutorial service in return for the grant. To differentiate between this service and the divisional policy, the previous principal had developed a "Low Incidence Resource Program." The resource teacher described the program,

In June I meet with parents and explain the program and responsibilities for the coming year. I meet with the students too. I give them a school orientation and an overview of next year's program. I observe in the classroom and work with the students in the classroom one period per

cycle. I usually work with other students too in a team teaching fashion. I spend 12.5% of my scheduled resource time in the classroom and 12.5% of my resource time in regularly timetabled consultation. The rest of my time is spent with students. I see the students in a small group for 40 minutes per day. Other consultation takes place during lunch hour or outside of school. At the beginning of the year I spend my time training teachers and assisting them with modifications. I use forms to document. After the first reporting period I analyze their tests.

The teachers who are timetabled to consult with me have less preparation time than the others so I have agreed to meet them in the staff room so that they can have coffee or a cigarette while we talk. This is usually their only break in the day and I feel that I have to meet them half way. I use a form for the consultation times to keep a record of our discussions and plans but we talk in an informal way. Others are allowed to interrupt. You have to do that if you want them to be on your side.

The "High Incidence" resource teacher stated that she spent about 50% of her scheduled resource time consulting with teachers at the beginning of the year and about 25% of this resource time during the middle part of the year and about 10% of the scheduled time at the end of the year. She described her program,

The teacher usually discusses the referral before it is written. If we decide it is necessary, the teacher fills in the form and it goes to the administrator for his signature. I do a cumulative file search and observe in the classroom. Then we have a referral conference or information meeting with all of the student's teachers. We decide the route we want to go. If my information doesn't agree with the teachers' information, I then observe the student in the other teachers' classes. After we decide the plan we are going to follow, I contact the parents. I can now give them more information. Then I do diagnostic testing and teaching. I have a meeting with all of the teachers in a group and explain what I have found. If any teachers would like assistance to develop an educational plan, I ask them to see me alone. At this meeting the teachers give suggestions and I write them down. Often they can help each other a great deal. After the meeting they drop into the resource room to discuss the student and develop their own plan. If I haven't heard from them in about 2 to 3 weeks, I check. I send out monthly progress reports and I check each student's work. I use a student's evaluation to see how things are going. I use the referral conference and educational planning/meeting conference stages, and provide ongoing feedback. About 75 to 90% of the cases never get closed until the end of the year. I monitor rather than close. Even if things go well the teachers still come to see me until the year ends. I draw back but it is very hard to close. With the more serious cases there is more parental involvement.

Strategies used to encourage collaboration between classroom and resource teachers were different because of the different nature of the positions.

Because I work in the classrooms I know what is going on and the teacher's style. I also send out notes so that teachers will keep me informed and I keep reminding teachers. If they don't follow through I ask them when we're consulting.

I encourage the teachers to see me. I use 'alert forms'. Teachers are asked to fill them out reporting student progress and send them to the resource teacher. I have group meetings and use peer pressure to encourage the teachers to modify the programs. When I have a meeting, I always arrange the next meeting for follow-up and coordinate the dates with everyone there. I share responsibilities with them, for example, I will make the phone calls to parents. To facilitate communication the resource teachers used

humour, sympathy, empathy, honesty--even if it hurts, active listening and clarifying, hope, encouragement and praise.

I try to play a 'smooth role', I use encouragement and positive strokes, positive attitude, 'we can do it', offer support/help in any way--for example, I will take their lunch duty if they have no 'prep' that day.

The resource teachers controlled the amount of change expected from classroom teachers and students when modifying programs by using their classroom experience to guide them. One called it "instinct."

I look at 'their' time, other demands, and I confront them if I feel that the change is too slow. I'm 'on top of them'.

I use the educational planning meetings to prioritize the needed changes and we decide what we will begin to work on.

The resource teachers described the teachers' attitude to change as 'traditional'. They don't like change. They have perfected their techniques. If someone else proves something works they will change.

Slow but acceptable. Some are more resistant than others. They want to know, 'Will the change benefit or make more work?' A young staff loves change but an old staff doesn't.

The resource teachers described the teachers' attitude to resource/consultation/mainstreaming as:

excellent towards resource and consultation , not adverse to modifying programs but wish a return to segregated special education classrooms.

They are positive and perceptive. They know their limits as far as special needs students are concerned.

The resource teachers handled conflict with the classroom teachers by:

acknowledging the other's opinion, letting them have their way on a trial basis and observing the results, and negotiating.

Sometimes we 'gang up--two on one', point out what could be done and make it happen then observe the results, use 'wits'--if I have a request I try to do something for them first, try both ways and evaluate, try to make them feel that its their idea.

They both felt that they managed conflict well because they were good at confronting staff on sensitive issues. They stated, "I am direct and open." and "I can be aggressive if the issue is around kids."

Both resource teachers felt that the resource program had been a priority to the previous and present administrators and they were very happy with their role.

Consultation is timetabled, the expectation is set--formerly this was done forcefully by telling the teachers to see the resource teachers if their students were failing; the new administrator gives a 'pat on the back', complements staff on student improvement and recognizes team work. He continues to set the expectation.

One resource teacher credited the success of the resource program to the staff.

We have a new administrator. They both had different styles but both supported the program in the same way. The teachers are professional and hard working. The resource personnel doesn't matter. Most of the teachers would do it anyway. They just need 'permission'. This is a strong willed staff. The atmosphere has been maintained even though the staff has changed. There is a good social atmosphere--they are good friends, trusting and caring.

Incentives were provided for the implementation of new programs (extra preparation time, time off for professional development, smaller class size, recognition by peers and administrators) and for participating in the collaborative consultative resource program.

The Resource Program: Views of the Administrators and Teachers

One administrator described a resource program where 'Low Incidence and slow learning' students were identified for resource assistance before they came to the junior high school and other "High Incidence" students were referred by classroom teachers.

The resource teacher diagnoses and gives advice to teachers. The students go to the resource teacher or have peer tutoring. It's very different from the elementary school where much less tutoring occurs. The divisional "model" is still there but there is more tutorial. We are 'rich' in resource help and want two full time people.

The other administrator stated that this school followed the divisional policy with a "high level of maturity."

The resource teachers are accountable and credible. The teachers usually approach the resource teachers and discuss the student first informally. If diagnostic teaching and assessment are required there is an official referral. There is program modification and regular involvement (tutoring). The forms have been altered. The process varies with teachers. Some are resistant. This policy doesn't exactly fit everyone's needs.

The amount of time the resource teachers spent consulting was unknown by one administrator--"I don't know--often--a fair bit of time." and estimated at about 20% by the other administrator. Both were positive about this time and thought it was important. One thought the the amount of time spent consulting was "about right."

Four of the 28 teachers who received the questionnaire responded. As this number is low, it is difficult to determine if these responses reflect the actual situation and the opinions of the staff. Three of the respondents indicated that they had students on individualized programs. The number of students on such programs ranged from 1 to 10. Three had referred students to the resource teacher this year. All had participated in informal discussions with the resource teachers about students. They reported discussing from 3 to "lots" of students each this year. All reported students with failing grades in their classrooms. All had more students failing than they had referred to the resource teachers. All stated that they used the resource teacher service as much as they could. Only one stated that they refer all students who risk failure to the resource teacher.

The teachers described a resource program that seemed to be consultative, but it was unclear whether the "remedial programs" mentioned occurred in the classroom or the resource room. It is unclear which resource model they are describing.

Discusses referral with referring teacher and other teachers that teach that student, informs the parent of testing to be done, tests student, informs parent, teacher and student of problem areas and discusses program modification, has meetings with the above groups separately.

Obtains information from teacher re: problem, interviews/ tests student, consults with teacher(s) and reports findings, sets up a plan, informs parents/student as necessary.

Interviews the teacher, pin points problem area, then sets up a remedial program.

When asked to choose a description which best described the way the resource teachers in their building provided service, three of the respondents chose "Students see the resource teacher for remedial instruction on a regular basis. In addition, the classroom and resource teachers meet to discuss their programs and to develop a written educational plan that outlines the classroom and resource programs." One chose remedial instruction and on-going informal discussion. No respondents chose a consultative resource room program. It may be difficult for the respondents to perceive that there are two different resource programs in the school. The choice of three respondents seems to reflect the Low Incidence program as they chose an item which combined tutorial service and classroom program modification.

The resource teachers in this school seem to spend the largest amount of school time in consultation of any school in this study. During the interviews, which were held after school, I observed many teachers dropping by the resource room to consult. The resource teachers in this school were also the happiest with their resource program and did not describe any areas that they felt should be changed. They felt that the program was working well and that it was supported by the staff and administration.

All respondents described some sort of discussion with the teachers before proceeding with the referral, some method of determining the 'cause of the problem' and discussion of program modifications or the development of a remedial program or

plan. Three of the respondents selected the item stating that during the referral conference "the resource teacher asked me what I thought the problem was." Three stated that the resource teacher alone decided on the method of diagnosis. Three stated that all parties gathered diagnostic information on the student. One commented that the classroom teacher played a minimal role. The extent of the use of collaboration is unclear.

During the educational planning stage three thought that the educational plan was developed together through negotiation and discussion. Three thought that no conflict or disagreement occurred. When it did occur it was open and discussed. All agreed that communication was open and two way. Half thought that the resource teacher planned and implemented the program alone. Half stated that the plan was evaluated by the resource teacher alone.

One of the administrators described the teachers' attitude to resource/consultation/mainstreaming as "positive towards resource (some negative)", unsure about the attitude towards modifying programs ("I suspect that some say 'yes' and don't do it, unless its something quite minor. They don't really individualize."), and not good towards mainstreaming. "It's not practical. They would like to see the kids in special education classrooms." The other administrator saw resource and consultation as a high priority. He saw the attitude to program modification as "varied" and the attitude towards mainstreaming as mixed--"it depends on the person."

Half of the respondents had a neutral opinion of the concept of mainstreaming and half were negative. All felt it was ineffective. The attitude towards the effectiveness of program modification varied with half of the respondents seeing it as moderately effective. Three thought that special education classes were effective. All felt that they did not have enough time to individualize/modify programs.

The resource teachers felt that sufficient time was available for program modification and the demands on teachers in this school did not seem to be as great as in other schools (more experienced teachers, fewer subjects to teach, not all teachers were required to participate in extracurricular activities).

This school demonstrates how a resource program can adapt to change without losing its basic principles. It is also an example of the effect an administrator

may have on the implementation of policy. In addition, it seems to demonstrate the effect of a staff open to discussion and problem solving. One resource teacher credited the success of the program to the staff.

The resource teachers in this school had different roles and different consultation styles. Yet they were able to support each other in their roles and indicated that they worked well together as a team. It appeared that the classroom teachers were more receptive towards consultation that was not regularly timetabled. Perhaps this is another example of the classroom teacher "giving" rather than "getting" since the timetabled consultation time resulted in less preparation time. The demands on the teachers at this school seemed to not be as great as the demands at Anacreon Junior High. This may account for the teacher cooperation with respect to reduced preparation time. The resource teacher was also sensitive to the teachers' need for a "break" in the school day.

In addition, this school seems to have developed a solution for the problem of resource involvement with students who have been previously identified as requiring program modification. When resource teachers provide consultation services under these circumstances, they often experience difficulty because the teacher has not requested the service. At Bayata the consultative resource teacher informs the teachers that these students will be in their class and that program modification may be required. If assistance is required with these modifications, they are to refer to the resource teacher. In this manner, resource teachers are not negligent in their duty towards the student and the classroom teachers maintain responsibility for the classroom program.

Case Study Five: Esbak Junior High

Esbak Junior High is medium sized. Resource programs seem to be a priority to at least one administrator. The staff at this school seem overwhelmed because of the many demands of the students. Only one completed questionnaire was received so it is difficult to determine if this is the case. The resource teacher responses seem to confirm this as well as the low rate of return.

This school has a large number of mainstreamed students. At one time it had nine segregated special education classes for slow learners. These classes have all been eliminated. Two special education classes for mentally handicapped students

remain. The teachers make poor to moderate use of the resource teachers and the administrator is attempting to change this by implementing the same resource programs as Bayata Junior High.

The School

Esbak Junior High School has a staff of 25 teachers, one full time administrator, one part time administrator and one clerical paraprofessional to assist teachers. Two full time paraprofessionals also assisted two developmental education teachers. Seven teachers as well as the principal were new to the school this year. These teachers were primarily experienced teachers who had transferred from other schools within the Division. One new teacher left at the end of the Fall term and was replaced by another teacher.

The resource teachers described the attitude towards professional development as mixed. "Some are very involved and others are not." Problems were solved by discussing them at staff meetings and this served as the stimulus for change. New programs were developed with the administrator attempting to provide the motivation.

He tries to get the staff to provide suggestions. He has to be the initiator. He's open to ideas.

He encourages change and is aware that it takes time. He tries to compliment.

The staff attitude to problem solving was described by the administrators as "not bad." Problems were discussed at staff meetings and the second item on the staff meeting agenda was always special students. "Resource, guidance, gifted, and others." Change was implemented out of an expressed need. There were many changes this year that resulted from school needs. Most of the staff was described as receptive to change and it was encouraged by "bringing lots of information to their attention--research, fill mailboxes, bring it (information) to staff meetings." Most (75 to 80%) of the staff were described by the administrators as being committed to professional development. Staff was involved in decision making through the staff meetings and committees. Resources were made available.

The new principal was making a lot of changes in the school and many found this demanding and stressful. Apart from the programs designed to improve student

discipline and work habits, he made changes in the resource program operation and was "working at making the teachers more accountable."

The resource teachers had both been in the school 3 years. One had initially come to the school as a classroom teacher and had been given some resource teaching responsibilities. She then replaced a resource teacher that had left the school. She had many years of teaching experience at both the elementary and junior high school levels and had worked as a resource teacher in the past at another junior high school in the Division. The other resource teacher had many years of special education classroom experience and had worked as a resource teacher in a special education school for trainably mentally handicapped students before coming to this junior high school as a resource teacher.

The principal had come to Esbak Junior High from Bayata Junior High where he had initiated the "Low Incidence Resource Teacher Program." The former principal of Esbak Junior High had developed a teacher tutorial program similar to the ones at Commason Junior High and Dr. Darrell Junior High, the previous year. When the new principal came to the school, he cancelled this program and designed a "Low Incidence Resource Program" similar to the one he had developed at Bayata Junior High and redid all the teachers' timetables. The resource teachers were very happy with this and the other new ideas.

We work as a team and help each other out. The homework book program has real support (this was attempted in the past and was not supported by the staff) because everyone can see that the administration is doing their part too. The kids are positive. The principal has a much finer understanding of the resource process and the atmosphere is much less antagonistic. We don't have to 'fight the staff'. Consultation time has been timetabled and the school timetabling is much better.

The relationship between the resource teachers has changed and we work together as a team much more. There is no resentment and we share ideas. The staff is very supportive and there has been growth over the three years I have been in the school. The principal has made a great difference. We are free to attend department head meetings now. Time was timetabled for us to go. The principal likes to see us sitting in the staff room talking to teachers (the previous principal had discouraged this) and we feel that he supports us. I feel comfortable and can confront teachers without it having deleterious effects to me. The principal comes in our room a lot but we feel he is positive and not checking up on us.

Approximately 360 "lower and middle class students" attend Esbak Junior High. Many students come from government subsidized housing and multifamily dwellings such as apartment blocks and condominiums. Single family homes are also in the area. The school has two developmental special education classes and formerly had six special education classes for slow learning and severely learning disabled students. These classes were phased out over a two to three year period and the students now attend local schools. These students had a reputation for being severe discipline problems and the school has had a reputation for being a difficult place to work. This reputation continued even after the special classes were closed. The teachers at this school feel that it is one of the more stressful schools in the Division. The administration spends a great deal of time assisting students who have problems with discipline and poor work habits. New programs in "teaching for success", discipline, homework completion and the keeping of notebooks were developed and implemented within the school this year.

The Resource Program: Views of the Resource Teachers

One of the resource teachers described a resource program that included the stages of referral, referral conference, observation, testing, pull out or program modification.

The teachers speak to the resource teacher before the referral is completed and then the form is completed. It is given to the principal who screens the referrals. He makes comments and suggestions and sends the referral back to the classroom teacher if he feels that the problem is not a resource problem. If he approves of the referral, it is passed on to me. We then have a referral conference, I observe in the classroom, phone the parents, see the student and conference with the student, do diagnostic testing, make a decision as to pull out or handling the problem within the class--some are referred for testing alone. When I get a referral I look at what the teacher has already done and look for things going well. When the educational plan is developed I look at what is realistic to expect--I don't lay on suggestions, I get them to give ideas. I use short term intervention if possible and meet with the teacher on an on-going basis. I close the case when everyone is happy--I get the teacher's feelings, the parent's feelings and the student's too. I have taken a course on observation of teachers and case conferencing and the educational plan is based on the teachers' personalities. This helps achieve success.

About 20% of the resource teacher's scheduled resource time was spent in consultation and about 50% of the students seen by the resource teacher were referred by the classroom teachers. At other times she conducted tutorial classes. She chose to do this as she thought the number of students in the other resource teacher's tutorial classes were too large and that she needed assistance.

The "Low Incidence" resource teacher described a program of a different nature.

The students come to the resource room once a day (they are assigned --they are slow learners and were not referred by teachers) instead of taking French. The largest group I work with is 5. We work on a mixture of things. It's partly tutorial and partly other skills such as study skills, reading, spelling, etc.

When asked how much of her resource time was used for consultation, the reply was

some-- not as much as we want, it's mostly informal. One preparation period per cycle has been timetabled for the teachers to consult with me but it hasn't always worked. It's coming. The consultation time is there but I haven't used it as much as I'd like to. Next year it will be different. I have difficulty approaching some teachers. It has been difficult trying to follow consultation stages because we are in a state of change. One teacher left at Christmas. There is lots of staff change.

Strategies used to encourage collaboration between the resource and classroom teachers included

complimenting the teacher for cooperation and positive feedback. This starts a cycle of positive feedback. I have turned a negative situation completely around. Some are more cooperative on their own.

We are in transition. The teachers have been told to cooperate, but are not yet following through. I try and show the teachers that I am observing everyone.

Communication strategies used included

talking, encouragement,--especially at informal times, empathy, help out--find books, make assignments.

Positive feedback, honest and open, straightforward personality.

Conflict was handled by being

more direct, tell them that I disagree, confront, agree to disagree.

Stay away from the person, ask their help, let them know they have knowledge you don't, on a casual one to one basis, compliment them.

The ability to confront staff on sensitive issues was rated as "good" and

Difficult to do. No one likes to do it. First I talk to the principal and get suggestions, then I talk to the other resource teacher.

One resource teacher stated that the amount of change expected of the teacher and student was controlled by "knowing the people and watching their reactions" and the other had no known strategy.

The attitude of the staff towards resource/program modification/ mainstreaming was described as varied.

Pressure, a lot of extra work, some don't do it, some question why.

A lot feel overwhelmed. There is a large number of mainstreamed students. They are frustrated by it.

Resources were readily available but time was a limit. Incentives such as verbal approval from the administration and time were available for new program implementation and for teachers to participate in the consultation process.

The Resource Program: Views of the Administrators

Because only one teacher in this school responded to the questionnaire, only the views of the administrators are reported.

The administrators felt that the teachers made poor to moderate use of the resource teachers in this school but that it was getting better. One described the following resource program:

'Low Incidence students and slow learning students' are pulled out of French or business education in groups of 5 or 6 for one period per day to upgrade skills. The resource teacher monitors assignment completion and teaches study skills. The 'High Incidence' referrals depend on the time available. We follow the divisional policy as I understand it. We don't do as much in terms of diagnosis--more informal than formal diagnostic teaching. The rest is pretty close. It's a 'patch up job'. The resource teacher and classroom teacher decide where the students belong. Peer tutoring is also used.

The other administrator stated:

the teachers discuss the referral with the resource teacher first, then fill out a referral form. It comes to me. I ask questions of the teacher. Recently I stopped a referral. The student had asked for resource help. I knew the student and questioned him. The student wasn't working. I want classroom and student ownership of their problems--'no dumping'. After I have signed the referral the resource teacher gets it. She meets with the teacher and they develop strategies for what should be done. The principal monitors. When the student is on track, they wean the student and close the case. The basic divisional model is there. The slow learners receive regularly timetabled resource assistance as an option to French. The divisional policy addresses 'High Incidence' students. For those students we follow the policy. For 'Low Incidence' students we have modified the educational plan form. Educational plans are developed for all 'Low Incidence' and 'slow learning' students. Consultation time is built into the timetable.

The principal stated that the resource teachers spend 10 to 15% of their scheduled resource time consulting. He felt that 10 to 20% was optimum. "They have too much other work to do. Consultation is very important. It is the foundation of the program." The other administrator estimated consultation time at 12.5% and stated that it was excellent. "It 'must' take place and should be regular and on-going."

The administrators described the teachers' attitude towards resource/consultation/program modification/mainstreaming as "positive" and "varied."

The teachers are very positive towards resource. There is some reluctance. I make sure the teachers don't see them as creating extra work. They are fairly positive to individualizing student programs--majority, not all. They are positive about integrating the developmental education students. They are positive about mainstreaming. They are concerned about not knowing how, rather than the concept itself.

Some are terrific; others, 'Leave me alone.', there are personality conflicts. There are about 4 to 6 'keen' teachers who individualize programs. Time is scarce. I don't know their attitude towards mainstreaming. I think it's a bandaid approach. Some students can be effectively mainstreamed and some cannot.

Incentives for program implementation such as extra preparation time, department head position (a co-curricular department head was appointed this year), positive feedback, encouragement, and professional development support were available. Incentives to participate in the consultation process were also available.

Esbak Junior High appears to be a school in the process of change and it is difficult to draw many conclusions about the school. Some interesting things were noted during the interviews, however. There does not seem to be agreement between the administrators about the effectiveness of the divisional policies of mainstreaming and the consultative resource program. This may make it more difficult for one of the administrators to encourage a consultative resource program in this school. Consultation time has been timetabled similarly to Bayata Junior High, but the resource teacher is not comfortable using this time to talk to teachers. Since this is new to the school this year and she has worked at this school for a number of years, she may be anticipating a negative staff reaction to the loss of preparation time. Demands on staff seem to be heavy at the school, so it would not be unreasonable to assume that the staff may not be accepting of this loss of preparation time.

It also appears that the resource program at the school had been largely tutorial until the change in administration. When the consultative role was given support by the new administrator, the consultative resource teacher chose to assist the tutorial resource teacher with direct service rather than focus on the development of a consultative program. The heavy demands on staff by the large number of students who require assistance may indicate that consultation may not be considered a priority by the staff. It appears that it may be difficult for the administrator to change the direction of the resource program at this school.

The case studies in this section demonstrate five different responses to a Divisional resource policy. Some similarities and differences will be discussed in order to develop a picture of the Divisional resource program and to indicate Divisional generalities.

Divisional Trends

Common Features of the Five Cases

The divisional policy stated that "The first priority is not to serve the child but to get the teacher hooked on success. When you remove the child you remove the reason for change." and that "The resource teacher does not assume responsibility for and/or 'ownership' of the problem." The resource teacher is to follow certain formal

consultation stages when dealing with a new referral and this referral is to be a request for assistance from the teacher.

Resource teachers all seemed to have knowledge and understanding of collaboration and communication skills. All had programming suggestions and most were very experienced. All had received divisional sponsored training in consultation skills. Yet it was difficult to keep responsibility for the student located with the classroom teacher. The divisional policy also states "the resource teacher's main function is to provide basic skills instruction to students with learning problems..." This contradiction may play a major part in how teachers view the resource teacher using a consultative role.

Certain students were identified as requiring special services at the elementary level or by previous teachers and therefore referrals were not always completed by the current classroom teachers nor did these teachers always desire resource assistance. In all schools some students were receiving tutorial assistance even though the divisional policy warns that this practice will make it difficult to encourage classroom changes. In this way, the resource teacher does assume responsibility for the problem and thus does take on the ownership of the problem. The consulting resource teacher at Bayata Junior High seemed to be the most proficient at maintaining classroom teacher responsibility. It appeared that this was accomplished by requiring a written referral to request assistance for program modification. Teachers were allowed to modify programs themselves if they wished. Students who had been previously identified were part of the 'Low Incidence' and 'slow learner' resource programs. In these programs observation and consultation were timetabled and it seemed as though the teachers were not as accepting of resource assistance.

It was unclear if any school followed the required steps or stages of consultation outlined in divisional policy. The resource program at Commason Junior High was varied with a tutorial program, an informal consultation component and some attempt to follow a more formal approach. Dr. Darrell Junior High's program was largely tutorial with some informal consultation. It appeared that no teacher referrals were made at this school; the resource teacher selected students based on test scores. Anacreon Junior High also had a varied program and a determined effort had been made to follow a formal consultative approach. The result was a protest on behalf of the teachers and no real collaborative educational planning. Bayata Junior

High attempted to develop two resource programs and acknowledged that the policy was not adequate for all students. An attempt was made to encourage classroom program modification in the tutorial program as well as encourage teachers to participate in the formal consultative approach. This school also modified the procedure to encourage teacher referral and ownership of classroom program modification. Collaboration seemed to be occurring when the program was described by the resource teachers but the amount of program modification and collaboration described by the administrators and classroom teachers cast some doubt on the accuracy of these reports. Esbak Junior High was just beginning to implement a consultative program. The 'Low Incidence' program and the program for 'slow learning' students seemed to affect the way these programs operated

Teacher Attitudes and Leadership Styles

With the exception of Commason Junior High, the concept of mainstreaming seemed to have partial support from the teachers. However, few felt that individualized programs were effective and almost all felt that special education programs were effective. They all felt that they did not have enough time to modify programs for special education students. The administrator at Esbak Junior High who had timetabled consultation time and provided support to the resource teachers in his school stated that the resource teachers "should not ask the classroom teachers to individualize or modify too much as the classroom teachers did not have the time." He also stated that the resource teachers did not have time to consult for more than 20% of their scheduled resource time as they had "too many other things to do." Lack of time to consult and modify as well as conflicting demands from other programs and the stress of working at the junior high level seem to make it difficult for this program to work. In addition, incentives to consult or modify programs are rare.

The orientation of the teachers to problem solving and change varies. At Bayata the staff is open and interested in professional development. This attitude seems to have a positive effect on the resource program. The other schools do not seem to have this ability to raise problems and work together to solve them.

Organization

Consultation at the junior high school seems to present some different challenges that may be unique to this level. The students at each school were very

different, and as a result, had different needs. The students in the French Immersion program, for example, often required short term remedial assistance with classroom work rather than assistance with the acquisition of basic skills or learning strategies. Some junior high students required assistance adjusting to the new expectations at this level. Some resource teachers reported that the majority of referrals were of grade seven students. The amount of consultation time required varies, with the most time needed at the beginning of a new year. Case dismissal seems to be difficult and resource teachers tend to not close cases until the end of the year. Even if active assistance is not required, they continue to monitor progress. Data-based instruction techniques are not used at this level. One resource teacher stated that it was because the students were too far behind grade level and there were too many 'gaps' in learning to correct. It may be that the program policy requires modifications to accommodate different school levels and different school clientele.

In summary, the resource teacher programs at the junior high school level seem to vary from divisional policy. This may be due to the difference in the organization of the junior high school, the difference in the developmental stages of the students and the extent of their needs and the difference in the attitudes and practices of the classroom teachers. Administrators also seem to vary a great deal in their philosophies of educating adolescents and in the way programs are developed within their schools. Maintaining responsibility for the students educational programs with the classroom teachers seems to be difficult for junior high school resource teachers. It is also difficult to find time to consult and collaborate on the desired modifications. One solution seems to be the separation of resource teacher and classroom teacher roles and the development of tutorial resource teacher programs.

CHAPTER FOUR

DISCUSSION

This chapter will discuss the findings of the study and attempt to draw some conclusions from these data. The discussion will involve a review of the variables isolated in chapter two as possible determinants of the success of the consultation process. Not all of these variables were measured in the study but the responses often illuminated these conditions and they are worthy of consideration. The author's speculation of changes that are required in the system to encourage the effectiveness of a consultative resource delivery model and some tentative conclusions about the behavior of personnel in this role will follow. Some suggestions for further research will conclude the chapter.

School System

Chapter Two concluded that when change is implemented within the school system, it is necessary for the system to sanction the change in some way, to provide the necessary resources for the change and to consider the school conditions. The resource teacher collaborative consultative model in this study was developed by a committee of administrators and resource teachers. It was developed as a response to changing needs in special education and as a result of the committee's study and recommendations. Classroom teachers were not represented on the committee nor were they consulted during the committee's study. Obviously they were affected by the resulting changes.

One of the committee's recommendations was to expand resource teacher service to the secondary schools. Up to this time resource teachers were employed only at the elementary level. Secondary teachers were not consulted or involved in any way. Because there were insufficient numbers of trained resource teachers to fill these new positions, classroom teachers without training were accepted for the positions if they promised to return to university within a specified time period to obtain training, and some elementary resource teachers moved to the new secondary positions. In addition, a division consultant was hired to assist with the implementation of the program. The program philosophy and policy were developed and money for additional supplies was allocated to each school. In this way sanction and resources were provided.

School conditions, however, were not considered. Conditions such as optimal class size, need for classroom teacher preparation time and time for classroom teachers to consult with resource teachers were not discussed. The committee was not aware of the effects of the culture of the school or the varying conditions at the elementary, junior and senior high school levels and did not consider possible role conflicts. It was thought that a tightly written job description would solve these problems.

Seymour Sarason, in The Culture of the School and the Problem of Change (1971) states:

If one assumes that these are some characteristics of the school culture, it becomes clear that introducing a new curriculum should involve one in more than its development and delivery. It should confront one with problems that stem from the fact that the school is, in a social and professional sense, highly structured and differentiated--a fact that is related to attitude, conceptions, and regularities of *all* who are in the setting. Teaching *any* subject matter, from this viewpoint, is in part determined by structural or system characteristics having no intrinsic relationship to the particular subject matter. If this assertion is even partly correct, any attempt to change a curriculum independent of changing some institutional feature runs the risk of partial or complete failure (page 35).

Sarason is referring to a list of tentative characteristics of the school culture that could adversely interfere with the objectives of change. In a junior high school, students seem to be hesitant about seeing a resource teacher because it identifies them as in need of assistance. Furthermore, a modified program also labels them in this way. Teachers may feel that referring the student is a reflection of their own teaching and by writing down the fact that they cannot "make" the student successful, they are admitting their inadequacies. Because junior high school teachers are usually content specialists who feel that it is their duty to impart facts in their content area rather than learning strategies, it may be more difficult for teachers at this level to deviate from the curriculum.

These examples illustrate the complexity of initiating change in the school system. Many aspects of the system may work against the change and will cause the change to fail or to adapt. Lack of awareness of this influence and/or lack of consideration were demonstrated by the resource teacher committee. However, the system "regularities" continued to exert their influence and the result was a resource program that was unlike the one the committee envisioned.

School Climate

"...[T]he obstacle of another characteristic of school culture: there are no vehicles of discussion, communication, or observation that allow for this kind of variation to be raised and productively used for purposes of help and change." (Sarason 1971) Sarason was referring to research that suggested that when teachers are confronted with data about their teaching behaviour and these data were discussed in terms of theory and intended outcomes, the teachers as a group were able to change. Discussion, observation and communication would be the norm, and therefore teachers would not feel singled out.

None of the schools had a systematic procedure for problem solving and change. None of the schools seemed to be oriented towards the identification and discussion of problems together to facilitate their resolution. Teachers did not feel that they were the impetus to program change and development. They felt that the administration made these decisions. They were often consulted and sometimes were given the opportunity to choose to participate.

While Bayata Junior High had no formal problem solving mechanisms, it did have an experienced staff who were very open and willing to confront each other. This was done informally, was initiated by the staff and had been a characteristic of that school for many years. Bayata also had the resource teachers who were the most satisfied with their program. They felt that it was successful and attributed the success to the classroom teachers. An initial referral conference was often held as a team and teachers would discuss the student and brainstorm ideas for program change together. This appeared to be highly productive. Any further assistance was to be individually requested. Commason Junior High was described as "buying in to the team approach" by the administrator. The resource teacher had tried to encourage open discussion through school inservices and group meetings. It appeared as though this was having a positive effect on resource teacher/classroom teacher consultation.

Teachers are alone with their children and problems in a classroom, and the frequency and pattern of contact with others like themselves are of a kind and quality that make new learning and change unlikely. When in the course of one's day-to-day professional existence the gaining of rewards is dependent almost exclusively on one's relationship with children, and these rewards are frequently indirect and nonverbal, and when the frequency of such rewards is not greater than the frustrations

one experiences, it should not be surprising if the well of motivation should run low or dry, or if behavior becomes routinized. To expect otherwise is to assume that one is not dependent to some degree, at least, on contact with and stimulation from one's colleagues (Sarason 1971, p.107).

...life for everyone in a school is determined by ideas and values, and if these are not under constant discussion and surveillance, the comforts of ritual replace the conflict and excitement involved in growing and changing (Sarason 1971, p.147).

Classroom walls serve as fortifications. They keep out ideas, information, the rest of the school, and the real world. ... Failure techniques are built into the structure of schooling, woven into its fabric, approved by rule and law, and taught to neophytes...(Hart 1989)

These statements underline the need for open discussion among professionals. The consultative resource teacher is a step towards the implementation of debate and change but this is a new way of solving problems for most and it will be very uncomfortable for many teachers. It will also be uncomfortable for most resource teachers and principals. At the secondary level these concerns are even more acute. In junior high school, I believe it is the norm that the frustrations exceed the rewards. Junior high school teachers are occupied with maintaining discipline and encouraging students to complete assignments. Mainstreaming seems impossible because it is already difficult to teach the regular education student. It is also the norm that the teachers are specialists in subject matter and feel that they have little in common with each other. In addition, there is little, if any time, during the school day when the teachers are all together. The only time intellectual discussion may occur is during a common preparation period. It is during this time that resource teachers wish to discuss program modifications.

The factors of trust and school politics were not measured systematically in this study. However, it appears that the trust level at Bayata Junior High was high. The teachers felt free to confront each other and to discuss their problems in the staff room. The resource teachers felt that they were part of this process and accepted by the staff. The resource teacher at Commason had been able to generate some trust and cooperation as the administrator had stated that the teachers were "buying in to a team approach." The questionnaire return rate was high in this school and the teachers were showing more interest and cooperation. The resource teacher appeared to be using many collaboration skills.

In contrast, the resource teachers at Anacreon Junior High were frustrated with their program. The teachers had gone to the Teachers' Association as a group to complain about the time spent consulting. Collaboration seemed to rarely occur, rather a list of suggestions was given, and the teachers chose whether to use them or not. This suggests that the trust level was low and that the resource teachers did not have teacher cooperation.

Dr. Darrell Junior High seemed to demonstrate even less resource teacher/classroom teacher cooperation. At this school, the resource teacher described collaboration as "trying hard to get along with the staff, staying for lunch, etc." Almost no consultation occurred. At this school the administrator stated that he did not support the concept of mainstreaming and he did not acknowledge the importance of consultation between the resource and classroom teachers. Were these opinions his own or a reflection of the teaching staff?

At Commason, the resource teacher was new to the school at the beginning of the year. The teachers had not yet developed any type of relationship with her and she was in the school on a part time basis. By the end of the year, things had changed dramatically--time had been increased and administrator and teacher support had been gained. It appears that it is possible and essential to the program's success for the resource teacher to build trust and to pay attention to the politics of the school. This may be the place to start when initiating a program in a school.

The resource teachers at Esbak Junior High were very happy to have the administrator supporting their program and they felt that they were able to discuss plans more freely with his support. However, not all administrators support resource teachers or programs in this way. It is important to note that this can be changed. It is also important to note that simply by supporting the program the administrator does not guarantee teacher cooperation or trust. The resource teachers must develop this themselves. This is demonstrated by the program at Esbak. It is still largely tutorial. Both Commason and Esbak had tried to initiate changes for the same length of time. The resource teacher at Commason was part time and had been able to build the trust and political strength to consult during the same time period that the administrator at Esbak had been attempting to do so.

Organization

Elementary and junior high schools are organized very differently as Sarason (1971, p.83) describes.

...we became increasingly aware that junior high personnel view the new student in September rather differently than elementary school personnel did the previous June. Whereas in June the elementary school viewed him as a *child*, in September the junior high viewed him as a *young adult*. These different views result in different expectations and are an important aspect of the discontinuity between structure and organization of the two settings. I am, of course, suggesting that meeting these different expectations is frequently difficult for some children...

There is another aspect to this problem that is illuminating of the school culture: *the differences in the ways in which pupils are viewed by elementary and junior high personnel are reflections of the differences in the ways in which these personnel view each other*. Many (by no means all) junior high school teachers view themselves as "specialists" on a particular subject matter, while they view the elementary school teacher as a somewhat superficial generalist--much like the differences between the general practitioner and specialist in medicine. Put in another way, the junior high teacher tends to view himself as "higher" and, therefore, better than the elementary school teacher. The fact that there are more men teachers in the junior high school than in the elementary school is undoubtedly a reflection of the view that the elementary school pupil is a child (taken care of by child-care kinds of teachers) while the junior high school pupil (who two months before was in elementary school) is a beginning young adult.

Corbett, Dawson and Firestone state that school organization in one of eight school conditions that affect any school project and thus needs to be considered carefully. They state that without organizational support, an individual's impact is muted by the actions, beliefs and attitudes of other school members (Corbett et al. 1984).

When the resource program committee decided to expand the resource program in this school division, these organizational differences were not considered. The elementary school program was implemented at the secondary level. Up to this time, a resource program had only existed in elementary schools, and if Sarason is correct, it could be viewed as "necessary for children who require care" by junior high school teachers. As junior high school students are not children, a resource program

would then be considered unnecessary at this level. Similarly, it could be inferred that a resource program would be needed by generalists but not by specialists.

Generalists see their pupils for a larger amount of the school day and do not see as many students. Because of the dramatic change in expectations placed upon the students, pupils who have not previously encountered difficulty may find it hard to adapt to the new structure. As a result, referrals to the resource teacher may increase and the resource teacher would deal with many more teachers for each referral. This information was not considered when designing the secondary resource program. Initially, all schools received one resource teacher for every 500 students. Later, this ratio was changed at the elementary school level to accommodate the increased involvement of the resource teacher in the early identification of students who may encounter difficulty in school. Presently, schools at the elementary school level receive one resource teacher for every 350 students. At the junior high school level, the schools are staffed with one resource teacher for every 500 students. The idea that the change in organization may cause difficulty for students had not been entertained.

Sarason also presents the idea that junior high school teachers feel that they are "higher" and that they are primarily men. Resource teachers at this level are primarily women and many in this school division are previous elementary school teachers (classroom and resource). Junior high school teachers may find it difficult to seek assistance from someone they view as inferior.

In addition, the resource teacher was not subject to the same guidelines. She had no classroom, no curriculum and a very small class size. The only other positions in the school that were similar were those of the guidance counsellor and the administrator. The resource teacher was to observe in the classroom and make suggestions about changing program. This is very similar to the role of the principal who often observes and recommends change during evaluation. Role confusion could make it difficult for the classroom teacher to consult and for the administrator to support the resource teacher's role.

Although the addition of resource teachers to the secondary school was seen as providing support for classroom teachers, the implementation of the policy of mainstreaming at about the same time seemed to increase demands on classroom teachers. Often, teachers feel that they do not have the skill to deal with the

mainstreamed child and they may be hesitant to implement a change because of genuine concern for the child (Hasazi 1976). In a study on Mainstreaming conducted by a Western Canadian Teachers' Society in 1984-85, junior high school teachers viewed the effects of integration more negatively than elementary teachers (see Table 2).

Who are the students whose programs require modifications? Are they students who are having difficulty--students with low grades? Sarason's premise is that students find it extremely difficult to tell a teacher that they don't understand the subject matter. In junior high school they usually prefer to not attempt the work or to misbehave in class. If this is the case, will the teacher be motivated to work harder preparing material or changing to benefit a student who is, at best, "irritating"? Will the teacher believe that the student could not handle the regular program when the student's behaviour seems to account for the lack of achievement? Will the students themselves wish to be singled out and attend special classes or be tutored?

Sarason also states that teachers find it extremely difficult to say that they are having difficulty presenting subject matter or that students are having difficulty learning in their classes. The consultative model expects them to do just that. For the first time, educators were asked how they might change in order to solve a problem or prevent one. This model may even require that they state this to someone they may regard as inferior or may regard as a part of the administration. Sarason further suggests that classroom teachers are not usually expected to discuss educational philosophy nor do they expect to have professionals observe them teach. Again, this is an important part of the consultative role. This discrepancy may be more acute at the junior high level where teachers view themselves as specialists. What can a resource teacher know about science? Spadek states that teachers are resistant when they feel that the suggested change is not realistic or because the consultant lacks credibility (Spadek 1982).

Table 1. Effects of Integration

On Special Needs Students						
		Very Positive	Positive	No Effect	Negative	Very Negative
Level	Primary	14%	56%	14%	6%	0%
	Intermediate	8%	57%	9%	13%	4%
	Junior High	3%	48%	11%	22%	2%
	Senior High	11%	40%	18%	13%	0%
On Students in General						
		Very Positive	Positive	No Effect	Negative	Very Negative
Level	Primary	9%	37%	24%	15%	1%
	Intermediate	7%	35%	21%	20%	3%
	Junior High	3%	30%	22%	29%	2%
	Senior High	3%	26%	37%	13%	8%

(Provincial Teachers' Society 1985)

The use of a resource teacher as a consultant is a relatively new concept and teachers have not been prepared to act as a consultee. They do not know how to act collaboratively and so may choose to be resistant instead (Carner 1982). Resistance to change has been the norm in schools as teachers work in isolation rather than cooperatively.

Program modification involves changing curriculum. Sarason states that teachers have difficulty deviating from the curriculum. In this school division, students were required to write school division exams at the end of the year. These exams are based on the subject matter in the curriculum. Resource teachers often had the experience of teachers stating that programs could not be changed because of these exams. In response to this problem, the school division stated that students who had a written individual educational plan which indicated that the student's program was substantially different from the regular curriculum could be excused from writing the divisional exams. In practice, few students were excluded. Problems such as "What does substantially different really mean?" and "What does the student do instead of writing the exam?" seemed to be of great concern to the administrators and teachers. In addition, because of feelings among staff that resource teachers had special privileges, most resource teachers were eventually given many classroom teacher responsibilities. Among these were exam supervision. This made it impossible for students to take oral exams or to be supervised while not writing the exams as no professional was free during the exam period. It was more satisfying to the staff to have all students write these exams. One of the concessions made, was to sometimes not use the exam grade in the calculation of the final mark and thus the parents were informed that the "grade" rather than the "program" had been modified.

These examples demonstrate the difficulties of implementing a program that is very different from the existing organizational pattern. All levels of the resource programs suffered from the lack of foresight and lack of consideration of the differences in school settings, but the junior high school has a very different school culture and thus this lack of foresight may have many more implications for a junior high consultative resource program. One administrator at Bayata Junior High who had previously taught at an elementary school supported this premise by stating, during our interview, that there was a significant difference in the operation of the program at the two levels. He specifically mentioned a large increase in the amount of tutorial time at the junior high.

Administrator

The administrator's leadership style was presented as a possible contributor to the success of the consultative resource program (Cox 1983). Many resource teachers suggested that they would like more "administrative support." Describing what this support entails was one of the aims of the study.

One aspect of the leadership style that was analyzed was the orientation of the staff to problem solving and change. This was previously discussed in the School Climate section. The conclusion that no school had an open problem solving strategy in place was drawn. It appeared that Bayata Junior High had an atmosphere of openness and constructive confrontation and that the resource program seemed to benefit from this, but this "atmosphere" did not seem to be the result of the administrators' leadership style. It had been a characteristic of the school for a number of years, weathering many changes in administrators and teachers.

Another aspect of leadership style that was studied was the extent to which the teachers were involved in school decision making. It appears that in most cases new programs or changes come from outside the school. These changes were developed by Department of Education personnel or Division Office personnel. Dr. Darrell Junior High developed a program for gifted students within the school but it appears that the impetus for this program came from the administrator. Esbak Junior High was also implementing a great deal of change but, again, this change was initiated by the administrator. The teachers were involved in the design and implementation of these programs but the idea of developing the program itself came from the administration. Administrators developed these ideas which came from perceived needs within the school. The administrator at Dr. Darrell decided that the school needed to attract more students and the teachers were told that their jobs depended on the gifted education program because it would possibly increase enrollment at the school. Esbak had a problem with student discipline and homework completion.

It seemed that instead of the administrator choosing to present the problem to the staff and the staff choosing to attempt to solve this problem as a team, the administrators chose to present the solution to the staff and ask for their assistance to implement it. As a result, the problem and its solution belonged to the administrator.

This also seemed to be the procedure followed when programs were developed outside the school. At Anacreon, the administrator would attempt to find a teacher who would agree to try the program. Incentives were usually an increase in preparation time. At Dr. Darrell the administrator designated time to hold a workshop at a motel in a neighboring town to develop the new program goals. The incentives were more time during the school day to work on the program and a transfer to another school if you didn't agree. At Esbak the new programs were developed at staff meetings and the administration participated in the implementation by taking some of the responsibility of implementation themselves. Consultants from outside the school were not usually used on a regular basis. It appears that the administrators are the primary educational leaders in the school. They decide on programming and do not usually involve other consultants. Thus, experience working with consultants or solving problems as a team is minimal. Sometimes the administrators are successful; sometimes they are not.

Because both are trying to implement teacher and/or curriculum change, the principal and the consultative resource teacher have similar roles. The resource teacher attempts to enlist the teacher's cooperation to develop new programs within the classroom; the administrator implements new programs within the school. The resource teacher does not have a regular classroom nor does she have a curriculum to follow. She is the only other person in the school who goes into classrooms. How does this role similarity affect the principal?

In diverse ways the principal would attempt to structure our role so that we would work with children rather than with teachers. With us, at least, the principal tended to describe problems as existing inside the child's head independent of the classroom he was in or the teacher he had. It was children who were problems and needed help .. In a number of instances the principal became visibly upset when he found out that in order to cope with certain classroom problems the teacher and clinic member had worked out and implemented a new procedure or approachMuch of what has been said above was put spontaneously, and in the context of heated discussion, by two different principals: "You are doing what I am supposed to be doing." (Sarason 1971, p.125)

The possibility that principals would find it difficult to have consultative resource teachers in their schools was not discussed by the committee even though principals were represented. They just didn't think of it. However, some principals did express concern at the time the role was developed and did not support the resource teacher's change of role. One administrator from another school division

publicly stated at a conference where this new role was being presented, that the resource teacher was taking over the administrator's role. This seems to indicate that the problem of role conflict was a real possibility. If the principal is uncomfortable with the resource teacher's role, will he provide assistance and support? Since it is a school division policy to have such a program, it is not likely that he would openly not allow the resource teacher to consult, but he may make it increasingly difficult to do so.

Only Bayata and Esbak had some timetabled consultation time. This resulted in the classroom teachers having one less preparation period. The same administrator initiated this plan in both schools and this administrator had been on the original resource teacher role planning committee. Even though consultation time was provided, it was not additional time, as was given to teachers by many of the principals in the study as an incentive to implement other new programs desired by the principal. By not making additional resources available, the resource teacher is 'blamed' for the consultation policy and the classroom teacher must 'pay for it'. The consultation time was also minimal. The principal stated during the interview that the resource teachers had too many other things to do and could not handle more consultation time. He also stated that resource teachers should not suggest modifications that required the teacher to do too much work or that were too different from the regular program.

At Dr. Darrell almost no consultation took place. The principal stated that he "had no trouble with it as long as it's consultation time (emphasis his) . My resource teacher works hard. I have no worry." At Anacreon the resource teachers had asked for regularly scheduled consultation time but the principal refused to honour their request. At Commason most consultation took place outside of school hours and was often between the resource teacher, student and parents. Other resources such as supplies were almost always available, but time to consult was not.

It appears that adequate resource teacher consultation time was either not seen to be necessary or not a priority with the principals. The amount of time required may be more than what is perceived to be necessary by administrators. Some of Friend's stumbling blocks to consultation were lack of time for consultation and administrator hesitation to implement the program with consultation time (Friend 1984). Yet most schools (Dr. Darrell indicated that the policy was not being followed) felt that they were essentially following divisional policy. Additional

tutorial was mentioned but they did indicate that this was in response to Department of Education dictates or to a perceived need in the school and that the policy was being followed too. Many felt that resource programs were a priority in their schools.

Since all schools had tutorial resource programs it seems that this type of program was unofficially supported by the administrators. The Department of Education was "blamed" for this deviation from policy even though the Department had never officially supported this practice and had officially supported the role of the consultative resource teacher. Classroom teachers do not like students missing their classes to attend tutorials. To accommodate the teachers, the schools all timetabled resource teacher tutoring during French or business education time. The special education students did not take these subjects. Resource was an option to the French and business education programs. Some schools gave grades for "resource." In this way, the resource program became a program more like the others in the school with a smaller class size. Resource teachers were given home rooms to register (this hindered consulting before school hours with parents or clinicians) and had extracurricular responsibilities after school. (This hindered meeting with parents, clinicians and teachers after school.) Because their time was rigidly timetabled, they were often unavailable during a teacher's preparation period or could not observe certain classes because those classes occurred during their scheduled tutorial classes. In this way the resource teachers' role became more like the role of the classroom teacher and less like the role of the principal. It was also common for students to dislike being 'singled out' or grouped for remedial classes. In this way Sarason's premises of school culture seem to have been validated (Sarason 1971).

Anacreon had a large extracurricular program and extracurricular activities were a priority for the administrator. The band teacher had extra preparation time as an incentive. The resource teacher ran a very large peer tutoring program which occurred at lunch time, before and after school. Anacreon's peer tutoring program was the largest in the school division and this was good public relations for a school which prided itself on its extensive extracurricular program and the large number of teachers who worked at the school after hours.

At Dr. Darrell the school logo was "Reputation for Excellence" and the priority was programming for the gifted. The resource teacher received few teacher referrals. She checked standardized test results and formed tutorial classes that were timetabled opposite French. The rest of the time she "pulled in " students who

were needy in specific areas and they were "grouped by availability." At Commason the principal had timetabled the students he felt needed tutorial instruction, again, instead of French.

What type of administrative support is necessary for the resource teacher consultant? In addition to time to consult, sanctioning programs that differ from the curriculum and supporting resource teacher consultation, principals should complement the resource teacher role by trying to establish an atmosphere where teachers feel free to discuss and solve problems. Resource teachers mention that they feel it is important that the principal not feel uneasy when he sees them talking to teachers during school time, that he understand that change often results in conflict, and that there is a need for confrontation. They also hoped that the principal would understand that change takes time. Sometimes conferencing appears to be casual as Gene Hall and Shirley Hourd call "incident interventions" (Hall and Hourd in McDonald 1989) or as McDonald calls it, "one-legged conferencing."

From the point of view of the initiator, the discussion in such conferences is often indirect, consisting of as little as: "How's it going?" "Why do you say that?" "Can I help somehow?" Quick and casual though they may be, however, such interventions accumulate over time, Hall and Hourd claim, and have a powerful effect (Hall and Hourd 1987).

Those inclined to regard serious work inside the schools as a matter of achievement and applying power are unlikely to believe this. They will believe that one-legged conferencing is a weak strategy, much inferior to such strategies as formal classroom observation and critique, curriculum intervention, or the design of new policy. I would argue, however, that strategies based on power relations, when wielded by outsiders, are more likely to engender destructive resistance than constructive change (McDonald 1989).

Principals need to know and understand the importance of consultation and the many forms it may take, the consequences of such consultation and that effective consultation is not "quick".

...what is missing in these proposals for change (and missing in those instances I have observed where some of these proposals have been put into effect) is any recognition that the principal is the crucial implementor of change. That is to say, any proposal for change that intends to alter the quality of life in the school depends primarily on the principal. One can realign forces of power, change administrative structures, and increase budgets for materials and new personnel, but

the intended effects of all these changes will be drastically diluted by principals whose past experiences and training, interacting with certain personality factors, ill prepares them for the role of educational and instructional leader. (Sarason 1971, p.148)

Teachers

...The teacher feels, and is made to feel, that her worth as a teacher will be judged by how much her class learns in a given period of time. ... Teachers and other school personnel have inordinate difficulty in thinking other than in terms of covering X amount of material in X amount of time. It would indeed be strange if they thought otherwise. After all, the school is organized according to grade levels, children are expected to be promoted at a certain time on the basis of achievement, and teachers at one grade level expect that the teachers of the previous level have adequately prepared their pupils, just as they know that the teacher to whom their children are passed on will expect that a particular amount and kind of material will have been covered. (Sarason 1971, p.152)

At the junior high school level, teachers are specialized and final exams are given on the material in the curriculum. Special education teachers, however, have no curriculum and think in terms of the student progressing or improving. They teach the skills necessary to show growth in fundamental processes as opposed to curriculum required facts and skills, and evaluate in a way that is very different from the classroom teacher. They think in terms of mastery learning rather than passing, and in skill levels or amount of material mastered rather than in marks. How do these differing attitudes and goals affect the consultative resource program?

No inservicing or discussion of these different values as a group has taken place in this school division to my knowledge. Judging by the difficulty principals have with deviating from the curriculum and allowing students to omit final exams, it seems that this is a problem that is left unresolved and undiscussed. It seems that the staff feel that the resource teachers job is to make the student fit the program rather than make the program fit the student. This is accomplished by providing remedial instruction so that the student will be able to be successful in the regular program or by assisting the student with learning strategies or study skills so that he can accomplish the regular program. This school division has developed a number of study skills lesson plans and has trained its resource teachers in the instruction of learning strategies.

However, effective tutoring requires some knowledge of the classroom program and strategies and study skill instruction requires the cooperation of the classroom teachers and their assistance in helping students use these skills in the classroom. To be successful in any special education program that has as its goal the successful return to the regular classroom, regular education and special education teachers must consult and cooperate. This results in more work and more time needed for both teachers. This study found that no responsibilities were taken away, but more were added.

It was the purpose of this study to determine what the teachers' attitudes towards the consultative resource program and its requisites were. The premise was that positive attitudes towards mainstreaming, change, program modification and consultation would have a positive effect of the consultative resource program. The study also tried to assess demands on teacher time and teacher priorities. It was thought that high demands on teacher time would work against the success of consultation and that if consultation was a priority with teachers it would be more likely that the program would be successful.

It was interesting to note that the teachers often felt that "their" attitude was positive but that the attitude of the "others" was not. The resource teachers indicated that the teachers' attitudes were more negative than the teachers' indication, and the administrators thought that the attitudes were more positive than the classroom teachers described.

The teachers stated that they were positive about professional development and change but did not attempt to assist or cause change. They did not use divisional consultants on a regular basis and felt that change was implemented from outside. The resource teacher at Commason commented that she thought the staff had more freedom to initiate change than they thought they had.

The teachers were positive about mainstreaming and felt that it was a worthwhile goal. This agrees with the data from the Provincial Teachers' Society study conducted in 1984-5. However, they did not think that it worked. They felt that segregated special education classes had been more successful. They seemed to feel positive about consulting with the resource teachers but were unsure about the effectiveness of modified programs. They viewed program modification as a lot of

work and were unsure about their ability to modify appropriately. They stated that they had many demands on their time and did not have sufficient time to modify programs. Other programs such as the extracurricular program were also demanding of time and were of greater priority. Program modification was not perceived to be a teacher priority.

These results are not surprising when the culture of the school and the demands of the junior high are considered. It may be surprising to some that the teachers are so positive. It seems that without adequate time and assistance and with other program demands being high, teachers would not spend time modifying a program for a handful of students. There are no incentives to do so and even though provision is made for exclusion from final exams for modified students, almost all still write the final exam on curriculum at the end of the year. Teachers' exam marks are collected by the administration in the building and by central office personnel and the results are provided to each department at the beginning of the next year to be used in planning programs and planning improvements where necessary. No such information is presented on modified programs.

The Provincial Teachers' Society survey (1984-5) found

Approximately 1/3 to 1/2 of all teachers with special needs students indicate that there is "no" or "minimal" program for them. Programs for students with behavioural disorders were rated poorest and programs for ESL students and learning disabled received the most positive assessment. ...Higher percentages of teachers viewed programs as inadequate than principals or other school-level support staff. Special education coordinators view program adequacy much more favorably than teachers.

The majority of all groups surveyed indicated that integration has a positive effect on special needs students. In particular, respondents stressed the positive effects regarding socialization and attitudes.

Eighty-five per cent (85%) of teachers indicated that workload increased, and of these approximately 1/5 stated that workload had "greatly increased" as a result of having special needs students in their classes. Similarly, 76% of teachers with special needs students indicated that their stress levels had increased.

Approximately 1/2 of the teachers and principals responding indicated that their attitude toward mainstreaming had changed in the past 4 or 5 years. For teachers whose attitude had changed, there was a tendency

to view mainstreaming more negatively. This change was particularly evident with junior high teachers. (Provincial Teachers' Society 1985)

It is understandable that teachers would not view mainstreaming and the resulting program modification as a priority.

Resource Teacher

It was the intent of this study to examine the qualities of a resource teacher that might account for a successful consultative resource program. However, as it was considered inappropriate to ask teachers to evaluate their resource teachers in any way, the teachers were asked to evaluate resource teacher qualities that they felt were important to the success of a consultative resource program. No real differences were identified in this manner and knowledge and technical skill, consultation skills, use of collaborative, communication skills, ability to appropriately control the rate of expected change and conflict management were all regarded as important. It was interesting to note that knowledge and technical skill was perceived to be the least important although still regarded as significant. All of the other skills were deemed to be equally important. Some indication of resource teacher skill was revealed in the interviews and this information is helpful to the understanding of why resource programs operate as they do.

The use of consultation stages (Block 1981) was followed most closely at Anacreon Junior High. Rather than encouraging success in the consultation process, the resource teacher's adherence to these stages resulted in the teachers rebelling and asking the assistance of the Provincial Teachers' Society. The teachers felt that they did not have the time to consult and were not willing to give up their preparation time, noon hours or other time outside of school hours. The resource teachers at this school felt that there were many demands on the teachers' time and understood their concerns. They wished to have regularly timetabled consultation time. It appears that it was impossible to successfully use all consultation stages in this environment.

Collaboration techniques were used frequently at Commason Junior High. The teachers indicated collaborative involvement at most of the stages of consultation. The resource teacher cited lack of time and newness to the school as reasons for not following the consultative stages and seemed to feel that this would be possible next year. The goal for this year had been to develop staff trust and understanding of the process. She seemed to be successful in gathering support for the resource program

as resource time was to be increased the following year and the principal had taken school time for an inservice on Mainstreaming and Program Modification conducted by the resource teacher.

At Anacreon, the resource teacher stated that she preferred to use the "expert" role (Bravi 1986) when she began as a resource teacher at the school. She was attempting to introduce more collaboration into the consultation process but was having difficulty. The teachers seemed to prefer the "expert" role and wished to have a list of suggestions from which to choose rather than collaboratively developing an educational plan.

The resource teacher policy for this school division states the importance of teacher 'ownership' of the student and the problems of programming for him. That is why teachers are to complete a written referral. By assuming an "expert" role, the resource teacher takes ownership of the problem. Because the classroom teacher remains detached from the process, he may not feel any obligation to implement a modified program. Involvement in the process helps to maintain an attachment to the case and a responsibility to ensure success (Bravi 1986). It seems that following the stages is not as important as using these stages as an opportunity to collaborate with the teachers.

This involvement begins with the teacher's request for help (the written referral). However, very often no referral is completed because the student has been previously identified as requiring assistance. If the resource teacher develops a program without a request for assistance from the classroom teacher, the teacher does not feel a responsibility to implement the program. If the resource teacher waits for a referral, she may feel negligent because she knows of the child's need for assistance.

At Commason the resource teacher was new to the school and asked the staff to submit referrals on all students who required help. This worked because she did not know the students well and depended on the teacher's assistance. At Dr. Darrell, the resource teacher planned and implemented a tutorial program of her own. The teachers did not need to be involved at all. At Bayata, the resource teacher compiled an alert list of previously identified students and gave it to the teachers. She then followed the students' progress. If it appeared that they required assistance in some areas, she called a team meeting of all the student's teachers to discuss the student and brainstorm solutions to problems. The teachers then completed a written referral

requesting help if they felt they needed it. If no referral was submitted and the student was still having difficulty, the resource teacher confronted the teacher with the problem. In this way the resource teacher was free from the guilt of knowing that a student might not be receiving the assistance they needed and still maintained ownership of the problem with the teacher.

Previously identified students with severe difficulties were assigned to the tutorial resource teacher for regular tutorial assistance during French or business education. The consultative approach was maintained at Bayata and Esbak by providing time for this resource teacher to work with students in the classroom and by scheduling regular consultation time with the teacher. The consultation was mandated by the principal. This program does not allow for teachers to request the service--it is required, but it does keep some problem ownership with the teacher. Although consultation with the resource teacher certainly is preparation, many teachers feel that they should control the use of this time and see timetabling it as a "loss." Thus, losing a preparation period on a regular basis may not motivate a teacher to consult. The resource teacher was sensitive to this issue and arranged to meet the teacher in the coffee room to consult over a cup of coffee. It is unclear if this consultation time was successful. The resource teacher at Bayata indicated that it was working and that because of her regularly timetabled classroom time she was able to observe the student and the program regularly. However, McDonald states that observation with feedback is a powerful tool only when responsibility and vulnerability are shared (McDonald 1989). Resource teachers have to be sensitive to this issue when observation and consultation are timetabled rather than requested. At Esbak this consultation time was not used on a regular basis.

The principal is certainly providing some incentives for classroom teachers to consult. These incentives are not as positive as those provided for other programs, but they are incentives. (Other incentives involve the addition of preparation time rather than regulating how existing preparation time must be spent. It is understandable why the administrator at Anacreon has not also done this even though the resource teachers had requested it. At this school the teachers are spending much more time on extracurricular activities and if they would lose a preparation period too, they may again revolt.) It is interesting to note that when the same administrator tried to implement this tutorial/consultative resource role at Esbak Junior High, the resource teacher did not use the consultation time provided and the consultative

resource teacher gave up some of her consultation time to assist the tutorial resource teacher with the tutoring. It appears that just 'making time' is not sufficient to ensure consultation. However, it is very difficult for it to occur without the time.

It was difficult to assess the impact of the resource teacher's communication skills. The resource teachers at Dr. Darrell and Esbak seemed to prefer a tutorial role and this may be due to a perceived lack of some skills on their part. All resource teachers were well aware of the importance of communication skills. The area of conflict and confrontation seemed to be an area of concern among the resource teachers. The resource teachers who were most confident in this area came from schools where they felt secure. The most open and confident were the resource teachers at Bayata. At this school the entire staff was not fearful of confrontation and discussion as it seemed to be a way of life for them. The resource teachers at Esbak suggested that confrontation and conflict were easier to handle now because of the change in administrator who, they felt, understood the resource teacher role and its stresses. They felt he supported them and the program. The resource teacher at Dr. Darrell had the least support by her administrator and felt the least comfortable with conflict and confrontation.

All of the resource teachers understood the importance of controlling the rate of change. The resource teachers at Commason and Bayata seemed to be able to let the teachers be active participants in the process. They were not as concerned that the program be "correct" as they were that the teacher initiate, implement and evaluate it. The resource teacher at Anacreon stated that this was difficult for her as she preferred the "expert" role and was frustrated at the slowness of teacher change. It seemed that the resource teachers at Commason and Bayata were concerned with developing a teacher attitude and commitment to programming rather than just the program itself. This may explain why the process was not as frustrating to them. They could see progress in the way the teachers viewed program modification and progress in the way the process worked. Whereas the resource teacher at Anacreon saw that the program was not being implemented and that the process was not progressing.

It appears that the resource teacher herself has a large impact on the success of the program. Even though the system influences make it difficult to consult successfully some consultation and program change occurs at every school. Resource teachers report that some teachers welcome their assistance. A teacher at Anacreon

commented, "I have come to depend on the resource department at Anacreon, as the staff employed there is exceptionally efficient, understanding and professional."

It also seems that there are certain teachers at every school that are willing to support the consultative role. One of the resource teachers at Bayata commented, "They are a professional hard working staff. The resource personnel doesn't matter..."

Conclusions

This study attempted to isolate some of the variables that might contribute to the success or failure of a consultative resource program and to determine what their influences might be. Five junior high schools were studied and it was found that although all the schools had the same resource program policy the actual programs were quite different. The one consistent feature was the presence of resource teacher tutorial programs for some students during the French class. All schools had some regularly timetabled tutorial instruction even though the divisional policy was developed to change this practice. The Department of Education or the needs of the school were given as the cause of this deviation from policy. Why did this happen?

System factors that could cause these problems or adaptations were not anticipated. The most important unanticipated factors were the culture of the school and in particular the culture of the junior high school. The teacher perception of students as 'young adults' who should be responsible, the rigid timetabling, specialization of teachers, and the importance of not deviating from the prescribed curriculum, as well as the role conflict with the school administrator seem to be important factors that require acknowledgement and change. Until teachers can be freed of the restrictions of following curriculum and until schools see learning as a developmental process that varies for everyone and construct flexible programs that reflect and respond to this variation, it will be very difficult, if not impossible, for good programming for special needs students to occur. At present, resource teachers and classroom teachers are speaking different languages with different goals. The goals of special education are not the goals of regular education and as long as teachers feel that they are being evaluated by regular education goals they will not embrace special education ideals.

Although administrators say that teachers are free to vary curriculum and to modify it, teachers seem to view divisional final examinations based on curriculum as

a contradiction. It seems that administrators do not ask teachers to demonstrate how they have deviated from the curriculum to accommodate the needs of their students but do ask that the 'course is covered' and that the marks are 'good'. To do the former would require teachers that are willing to modify programs and administrators that are instructional leaders .

The principal may be this or that type of personality, he may be experienced or inexperienced, he may be likeable or otherwise, he may be intellectually bright or average--if he is not constantly confronting himself and others, and if others cannot confront him with the world of competing ideas and values shaping life in a school, he is an educational administrator and not an educational leader. (Sarason 1971, p.147)

The person in the school that best fits this description is the resource teacher. It is her role to question, to understand how children learn, to know how to diagnose learning problems, how to develop program. She looks for the best methods of instruction and is knowledgeable in the management of student behavior. It would not be surprising if the principal might feel that the resource teacher is encroaching on his job description and thus would make it easier for her to be like the other teachers in the school with a class and a timetable. This role with the right to change curriculum may be disturbing to administrators.

However, it is just this role that is necessary for all teachers if education is to address the needs of all students. What is implied by the resource teacher role policy and what is needed for program to meet individual needs is for regular educators to become special educators. All teachers must be given the right to be professionals who can determine their own curriculum based on the needs of their students. Administrators also must come to deal with this new role and are challenged to become educational leaders (Sarason 1971) rather than administrators. Until teachers are trusted to be professionals who are capable of and accountable for designing student programs that not only deviate from curriculum but suit their students' needs and administrators are educational leaders who challenge teachers' thinking and encourage conflict and the excitement of growth and change any change in curriculum or role will fall short of success.

Does this mean that resource programs should not be consultative? Should we return to special education classes? No. Special education classes have problems too. We well know the problems of segregation and regular education teachers do not support this isolation from society (Provincial Teachers' Society 1985) . Society itself

is changing and the handicapped are demanding the right to integration and with it, the need to modify societal structures to support this integration. The school system is a reflection of society and it is not likely that it will go back to a time where it was acceptable to segregate people because of handicapping conditions. These students must be a part of society during their school years as well as during their adult years. Segregating them until 'they can fit' does not work either. They never are perceived to 'fit'. Even the partial withdrawal from class that was practised by the schools in this study will not be of benefit to the student in any way unless the special education teacher and the classroom teacher are willing to cooperate and consult. There will be no transfer of skills learned in the tutorial program (Deshler 1981). Consultation is not a choice, but a requirement necessitated by society's goal of equality of opportunity for all.

In August, 1989 the Provincial Department of Education and Training issued a policy statement and procedural guidelines for special needs students in the public school system. Guidelines were provided to assist school divisions in the following areas:

- * an education programming and placement process for students who require modification of their educational program.
- * a division/district-wide planning process for the education of students with special needs.
- * increased involvement of parents of students with special needs in program and placement decisions
- * an appeal process for disputes involving students with special needs.

In the province, as a matter of public policy, all children are entitled to a public school education. The Public Schools Act requires that "Every school board shall provide or make provision for education in Grades 1 to 12 inclusive for all resident persons who have the right to attend school" (Section 41[4]). This section of the Act constitutes mandatory legislation for school divisional/districts to provide education programs for all children with special learning needs.

It is the policy of the provincial Department of Education and Training to provide for all children in the province access to learning opportunities which are commensurate with their needs and abilities. For students with special learning needs, this means that:

* school divisions/districts are responsible for offering appropriate educational programs and the support services students need to benefit from these programs.

* education programming will be provided in the most enabling learning environment available or possible under the circumstances. In the majority of cases, integration in the regular classroom, with the provision of special supports, affords such a setting.

* education programs will be individualized when appropriate

* the program planning process will involve a team approach, the team consisting of all those who have information that is relevant to the student--parents, educators, support personnel --and the student if possible.

This policy is consistent with the intent of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, Section 15, which grants equality of rights for all individuals, including "the right to equal protection and equal benefit of the law without discrimination and, in particular, without discrimination based on race, nationality or ethnic origin, colour, religion, sex, age or mental or physical disability." (Education and Training 1989)

How do we fulfil this mandate when we know that the consultation process has major difficulties? Knowing that the consultative role has these difficulties, and that many factors influence its success, can in itself be helpful to those who are struggling with its implementation. This knowledge can help us be more understanding of ways that we can facilitate its optimal implementation. In addition, by maintaining consultative resource teachers within the school we are also working towards the ideal of professional educators and educational leaders. These resource teachers are given the opportunity to be professional role models. What can be done to assist the effectiveness of these teachers?

Training of resource teachers is essential. Resource teachers need to be aware of the sociology and politics of the school and need to learn to manage their political role. The resource teacher at Commason was able to use this knowledge to her advantage. Resource teachers should understand that it is necessary to encourage an open atmosphere that allows for the discussion of educational theory and ideas as well as problem solving among staff. They should facilitate this to the best of their ability and encourage their administrator to do so. They should understand the effect of the organization of the school on the degree to which consultation can be implemented. They should understand that there are limits to the

success they can experience that are not of their control. By understanding what these limits are, they can work towards their change. They should understand the importance of trust and try to build a high level of trust within their building.

Resource teachers should understand the limits placed on the administrator to provide the resources necessary for consultation and try to gain these resources in a non-threatening way. They should understand that administrators may feel threatened by the conflict of the resource and principal roles. Resource teachers are a minority within the school and resource programs are often not priorities. They should find ways to encourage their administrator to make their program a priority. The resource teacher at Commason worked with parents a great deal and used their influence to change the administrator's priorities.

Another way to make the program a priority is to develop a good working relationship with the classroom teachers. Understanding the perceptions of regular educators may encourage this.

..."teaching is a lonely profession" by which we mean that the teacher is alone with her problems and dilemmas, constantly thrown back on her own resources, having little or no interpersonal vehicles available for purposes of stimulation, change, or control against man's capacity to act and think foolishly.

Constant giving in the context of constant vigilance required by the presence of many children is a demanding, draining, taxing affair that cannot easily be sustained. Even where it is sustained on a high level it still does not always prevent guilt feelings because the teacher cannot give all that she feels children need. To sustain the giving at a high level requires that the teacher experience *getting*.

One member of the Yale Psycho-Educational Clinic has maintained that a good part of whatever success we have had in working with teachers was due to the fact that we were giving to them and this was atypical in the lives of the teachers. (Sarason 1971)

Teachers do respond to consultation when they perceive that the work load is being shared. The resource teacher at Commason was aware of this and varied her expectations according to the amount of work the teacher could handle. If they were overloaded she would take the 'giant's share'. She met with parents and through these meetings encouraged homework completion and behavior management with the parent's assistance. This not only provided help, it did not project the notion that all of the problem was due to the teacher's inadequacies. Resource teachers need to be

sensitive to the fact that a request for change implies that the status quo is ineffective and recognize that the teachers need more than suggestions or ideas. They also need to be sensitive to their own needs for 'getting' and provide for the receipt of 'giving' themselves.

The use of collaboration is effective partly because it indicates that the teacher is important, and partly because it does not allow the resource teacher to take responsibility for the problem. It is important that the resource teacher communicate respect for the teacher's knowledge and expertise and collaboration shows this.

The management of conflict and the ability to confront seem to depend on the resource teacher's feeling of security in the school. If it is a school norm to confront, as it was at Bayata, then it will not be difficult. If it is not, the resource teacher needs to be careful, always aware of political alignment and the degree of support the program receives from the administrator.

Administrators can support the program by providing the required resources and learning to not feel uncomfortable with the ideas of consultation and program modification. Understanding why this discomfort occurs is a beginning. The administrator must learn to trust the resource teacher. This may best be accomplished by communicating with the resource teacher on a regular basis so that he will be informed and can be a part of the process. The principal of Commason indicated that this was important to him. In a school where trust is high, the principal and the students and parents should be part of the 'team'.

Huefner cautions against the hasty implementation of the consulting teacher model and warns of possible consequences.

Notwithstanding the potential of the consulting teacher model, at least seven serious risks attach to wholesale adoption of the model without adequate preparation and conceptualization. Minimization of each risk will require careful assessment of existing systems and personnel, along with realistic goal setting. It will also require policy makers to resist the urge for a "quick fix." The following risks are inherent in inadequate preparation for implementation of the model.

1. Ineffective Caseload Management...
2. Converting the Model to a Tutoring or Aide Model...
3. Unrealistic Expectations...

- (a) Viewing the Consulting Teacher Model as a Panacea...
- (b) Undertraining and Overloading the Resource Teacher...
- 4. Inadequate Support from Regular Educators...
- 5. Inadequate Funding Mechanisms...
- 6. Faulty Assumptions Regarding Cost Savings...
- 7. Faulty Assumptions Regarding Program Effectiveness...

(Huefner 1988)

She also raises some interesting points on the reasons for this choice of policy.

It is quite possible that various policy makers who support a consulting teacher model may have conflicting goals. Some may see the model as enhancing the goal of equitable access to special services across all groups of students; in other words, a concern for equity may be driving their support. Others may see the model as creating more cost-efficient service delivery; a concern for financial savings may be driving their support. Finally, others may see the model as increasing the possibility of quality individualized instruction at a building level; that is, the concern for educational excellence may be driving their support. Equity, efficiency, and excellence all have been primary motivators in various reform movements of the past, but usually one has been promoted at the expense of the other (Mitchell & Encarnation 1984).

In contrast, if equity, efficiency, and excellence are seen as equally important and compatible long-term goals, then presumably attention would have to be paid to gradual rather than wholesale expansion of the model, to determination of effective student/teacher ratios, to intensified teacher training, and to evaluation of outcomes.

If instruction sufficient to master individually determined competencies can be provided to all special needs students, the goals of equity *and* excellence can be realized together. Furthermore, the goal of efficiency will be met as well because the cost-benefit ratio will be more efficient than if one focused on mere economies of scale without attention to student outcomes (Huefner 1988).

This study shows that in order to achieve the success of special education students in the regular education class using a consulting resource teacher model attention must be paid to the regular education system as well. Major changes are needed in the role of the regular education teacher as well as the role of the principal in order to accommodate this approach. Hart calls for a restructuring of schools to

bring about learning by all students rather than remaining obsessed with transferring information.

Restructuring implies a willingness to look mercilessly at the burden of custom and ritual that has been laid on teachers. It implies a willingness to set them free to use their considerable good sense, intuition, energy, and enthusiasm (Hart 1989).

These changes will ultimately affect the education of all students and the organization of the school system as we know it. It will bring about the creation of the educational professional and should result in equity, efficiency and excellence for all students.

However, change occurs slowly. Until the conditions are optimum the consulting resource teacher will continue to struggle. Some teachers will be able to perceive of the opportunities this teacher provides to them to grow and change and will welcome her. They will be able to modify programs and meet curriculum requirements. Some principals will also see the benefit to the program and provide the support required to assist the consulting teacher in her role. They may also find assistance for the development of their role as educational leader rather than administrator. Some consulting teachers will be able to encourage this cooperation and will be able to see the implementation of many modified programs. For these people to persevere and increase their success year by year, they need to be aware of the factors that are affecting this program and those that affect their own performance and personal well being. Once aware they need to continue to work towards the change of these conditions.

Suggestions for Further Research

The goal of this study was to gain an understanding of the factors influencing the success of consultative resource teachers during the consultative process in junior high schools following a specified policy. Huefner states that comparative performance data are needed. Studies conducted to provide these data must be careful to describe the program under review in great detail. This study showed that when all schools were following the same policy the programs were quite different.

The variables selected for review in this study all seem to affect the consultative resource model in some way and seem to interact with each other. Further study is necessary to confirm this.

Further study must be done to gain more information about the personal characteristics and behavior of the people involved in the consultative process. Observation studies are needed to identify the most effective behaviors of resource teacher/consultants and the types of teachers who are willing to collaborate, modify programs and implement them. The effects of politics and administrator behavior also require study.

Future studies should also consider the variable of the student. How should the student and/or his parents be included in the process? What type of student benefits the most? What is the optimal case size for a consultative resource teacher? When should a case be dismissed at the junior high level? Is this more difficult because a student may be able to handle some parts of the program without modification and require these modifications in other curriculum areas?

The type of modifications also need to be considered. Different student bodies seem to require different resource models at the secondary level. A school that has already segregated students by the type of program offered in the school may require a much different approach than a school that has all types of students. Is data-based instruction relevant at the junior high school level? What type of program modifications do work well at this level?

The amount of time needed to consult may also vary according to school needs and according to the time of year. What is the optimal amount of consultation time or is there an optimal amount?

Another variable that was not considered is the variable of the social culture. Would this program be more effective in another culture? Would a culture based more on cooperation and less on competition have a more positive effect on the attempts of teachers to work as a team?

Policy makers need to be aware of the many influences on policy implementation and need to work towards system change. This change must be based on research and it must be recognized that system change does not occur by trying a new course of studies or creating a new teaching role.

In order to conduct meaningful research in this area we need to constantly evaluate change. We all need to look at our thinking about schools and may need to

change our own thinking before we can make any effective change in any aspect of the school system. To this end, the importance of evaluation that is not merely the confirmation of a personal opinion cannot be overestimated.

If the more things change the more they remain the same, it is because our ways of looking and thinking have not changed. This should not be surprising when one recognizes that the agents of change from outside the school culture are too frequently ignorant of the culture in which the change is to be embedded, or if they are part of the culture, they are themselves victims of that very fact. ...Recognizing the adversary gives one a basis for asserting that the problem is neither hopeless nor insoluble. (Sarason 1971, p.236)

APPENDIX A

THE RESOURCE MODEL

DIAGNOSTIC-COLLABORATIVE (DC)

INTRODUCTION

The current emphasis upon providing educational programs for students with special needs within the mainstream of education makes the development of functional support services imperative. The program aims at facilitating and supporting programming for students with exceptional needs within the mainstream of education.

The resource teacher is a member of the educational team and as such can function effectively if there is general agreement about the goal for the program, the operational model, and the respective responsibilities and relationships among all members of the educational team. The resource teacher's main function is to provide basic skills instruction to students with learning problems and to work directly with subject area teachers to assist them with instructional techniques, classroom management and program adjustments that would allow these students to work more successfully in the classroom.

I. REFERRAL

The referring teacher submits a written referral to the resource teacher through the principal, outlining the teaching/learning problem as he/she perceives it. In cases concerning referrals from parents, students, or school personnel other than the subject teacher, the resource teacher will complete and submit the referral form to the principal. This form is aimed at acquiring pertinent information concerning teacher's perceptions of the student's behaviour and other factors related to the problem. It also requests information concerning steps already taken to resolve the difficulty. The referral, completed by the referring teacher initiates the process of asking questions, and in doing so, the resource teacher recognizes the request for assistance from the referring teacher. (See School Resource Referral Form)

II. REFERRAL CONFERENCE

The resource teacher confers with the referring teacher (and principal if required) to review the referral and together plan diagnostic

procedures. The referral conference serves to attempt to clarify the reason(s) for the referral, and to pinpoint specific behaviours that are of concern to the teacher.

The questioning process may include questions about learner characteristics, learning correlates and instructional implications for each of these. Refer to Appendix

- see Learner Variables Guideline
- Charles - Form A
- see Referral Conference Guideline -Form B
- see Referral Interview Guideline - Form C
- see Sr. High Questionnaire - Subject Area
- Form D

These guidelines may be used to help to clarify concerns. Pertinent information may be recorded on the Resource Education Plan Form at this point.

As a result of information gathered from the referral and the referral conference, the purpose for observation may be established.

File the Referral and Educational Plan Forms in the Resource Room.

III. DIAGNOSTIC PROCEDURES

a) OBSERVATION

It is desirable that the resource teacher observe the referred student in the regular classroom setting.

Observation entails carefully planned, focused active attention by the observer to identify behaviour, elicitors of behaviour, sequencing of behaviour and consequences, if any.

(See Appendix in Observation and Behaviour Management Section)

Once a reliable pattern of behaviour emerges, systematic analysis of recorded observations can take place and informal conferencing with the referring teacher may be held to update information. Further data may be obtained from formal or informal testing.

b) Tests

Tests may be administered by the resource teacher to obtain concrete data regarding the student's:

- vision and hearing
- instructional level
- academic strengths and weaknesses
- learning styles
- behavioural patterns
- programming
- placement

On the basis of this systematic process of diagnostic procedures, inferences are drawn and tentative instructional strategies constructed, to be tried during the diagnostic teaching phase.

(See Appendix in Diagnostic Information Section for formal and informal assessments)

Record information for (a) Observation and (b) Tests on or with the Educational Plan Form.

(c) Diagnostic teaching

Diagnostic teaching is conducted individually or in a small group setting by the resource teacher to determine appropriate teaching techniques and materials based on the student's strengths and needs. The diagnostic teaching can take place in the classroom or in the resource room setting.

The diagnostic teaching phase tests the inferences, provides additional assessment data, and analyzes educational tasks and performance outcomes.

(See Appendix - this section - Sr. High Appointment Slip - for setting up testing or diagnostic teaching appointments - Form E)

Diagnostic teaching information is to be attached to the Educational Plan Form and kept in the Resource Room file.

IV. EDUCATIONAL PLANNING

a) Conference

A conference is arranged between the referring teacher and the resource teacher (also the principal if required) to discuss the diagnostic findings and to formulate program plans.

The resource teacher and referring teacher together evolve an educational plan for the student. Explanation of and open discussion about diagnostic procedures result in program and/or classroom modifications mutually agreed upon.

Record such information on the Educational Plan Form. This information is to be kept in the Resource Room File. See educational plan outline below. (See School Resource Educational Plan)

b) Educational Plan

The Educational Plan is designed by the referring teacher and the resource teacher should include :

1. diagnostic information
2. specific objectives b) Educational Plan
3. recommend methods, materials and resources
4. the roles and responsibilities of the resource teacher
and of the referring teacher
5. monitoring and evaluation procedures
6. parental contact

A written educational report is prepared, recommending well-defined techniques, materials and implementation strategies already tested and found workable which are compatible with classroom organization.

It is important that the referring teacher claims "ownership" of the referred student.

(See Appendix - this section - Sr. High Student Monitor Sheet - Form F - may be used at this time to monitor progress)

- c) The resource teacher will place a School Resource Cumulative Record form in the referred student's cumulative record folder.

V. FOLLOW-UP

The resource teacher will facilitate implementation of the educational plan. It is during this period that the referring teacher generally formulates his/her perceptions of the educational plan. During this time, problems concerning the utilization of the educational plan can be resolved. This may result in revision and/or modification of the initial educational plan, and the modified/revised program implementation is repeated if necessary.

After the program has been implemented, the resource teacher and the referring teacher will review the educational plan and will make any necessary revisions. The resource teacher will consult with teachers on an "as needed" basis concerning previously referred cases.

The resource teacher provides implementation assistance for the necessary period of time along with demonstrations as requested.

"The first priority is not to serve the child but to get the teacher hooked on success. When you remove the child, you remove the reason for change."

The School Resource Progress Report is to be completed following the implementation and kept in the Resource Room file.

(See School Resource Progress Report.)

VI. CASE CLOSURE

The case will be closed when the resource teacher, the referring teacher, and the principal view the student's progress as satisfactory.

When assessment of educational planning objectives indicate mastery, the case will be closed. The resource teacher does not assume responsibility for and/or "ownership" of the problem. The resource

teacher provides service for all teachers in the school and therefore cannot continue monitoring a situation once the objectives of the initial referral have been met. However, the resource teacher will consult with teachers on an "as needed" basis concerning previously referred cases.

APPENDIX B
INTERVIEW SCHEDULES

CONSULTATIVE RESOURCE PROGRAM

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

For School Administrators

ADMINISTRATOR INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

1. How many students are in your school? _____
2. How many students are classified as low incidence 1 (L-1) for a unit count of 2.5? _____
3. How many resource teachers are in your school? _____
4. How much use does your staff make of the resource teacher (based on the number of referrals you sign)?

	1	2	3	4	5
Maximum					Little or None

5. What is the experience level of your staff? (Approximate Numbers)
 - New _____
 - New to subject or grade _____
 - Experienced _____
6. How many teachers are on staff? _____
How many are new this year? _____
7. What demands are made on your staff in terms of new programs and other responsibilities?

8. Briefly describe the resource model in your school:

9. Has your school modified the divisional model in any way? Why?

10. What is the attitude of your staff to problem solving? What methods do they use? Is there a procedure in place?

11. How do you and your staff implement and/or develop new programs?

12. Is the staff receptive to change? How do you encourage change?

13. What is your staff's commitment to professional development?

14. Which programs in your school do you feel deserve top priority?

Why?

15. How do you involve your staff in decision making and/or program implementation?

16. When a new program is being implemented, is it easy to make resources such as personnel, materials, time, etc., available? Do teachers make use of these things?

17. What incentives do you offer for teachers to change or implement new programs? . . . to use consultation?

18. What are the attitudes of the teachers on staff to:

_____ resource and consultation?
_____ individualizing student programs?
_____ mainstreaming?

19. How much time does your resource teacher spend consulting with teachers?

20. What is your opinion of consultation time?

21. What do you feel makes a resource teacher an effective consultant?

Why?

22. a) When evaluating your resource teacher, which consultant skills do you consider important? (eg: empathy)

b) What knowledge do you feel is necessary?

c) What attitudes do you consider to be important?

d) What other areas do you consider for evaluation purposes?

23. Other comments:

CONSULTATIVE RESOURCE PROGRAM

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

For Resource Teachers

RESOURCE TEACHER INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

1. How long have you worked in the school as a resource teacher? _____
2. How many teachers are new to the school this year? _____
3. Do the teachers in your school have many demands placed upon them?

4. Do they have sufficient time to modify programs?

5. Are all the students you see, referred to you by classroom teachers? If not, how many are new referrals?

6. Briefly describe the way your program operates.

7. How much of your resource time is used for consultation?

8. Do you use a formal approach to consultation? Why?

9. Do you feel this is sufficient? If not, why is sufficient time not available?

10. Do you have any strategies that you use to keep the relationship between you and the classroom teacher a collaborative one?

11. What stages do you follow when using consultation?

12. What strategies does your staff use to solve problems?

13. What is the attitude of your staff to change?

14. How are new programs implemented in your school?

15. What is the attitude of your staff to professional development?

16. How does your administrator implement change or new programs?

17. Are resources readily available for new programs? . . . for modifying programs?

18. Do the teachers use them?

19. What incentives are offered to teachers to implement new programs? . . .
consultation?

20. What is the attitude of your staff towards: resource, consultation, mainstreaming, individualizing programs?

21. What programs are given priority by your staff? Why?

22. What communication strategies do you use when working with teachers?

23. How do you control the rate of required change so that it is tolerable and effective?

24. How do you handle conflict?

25. How would you rate your ability to confront staff on sensitive issues? Why?

26. Other comments:

APPENDIX C

THE QUESTIONNAIRE

CONSULTATIVE RESOURCE PROGRAM

SURVEY

For Classroom Teachers

This questionnaire surveys attitudes toward the current resource program in our school division. Since it has the potential to identify needs and propose solutions for an area that is of current concern, your cooperation in responding to it is appreciated.

The results of the study will be made available to you in the fall of 1988.

It should take about thirty minutes to complete the questionnaire.

PART ONE

1. How many classes do you teach? _____
2. How many students are in each class? range _____ to _____ average size

3. What subjects do you teach? _____

4. What grades do you teach? _____
5. How many students in your classes are on individualized programs? _____
6. How many students in your classes risk failing grades in their work? _____
7. How many students have you referred to the resource teacher this year?

8. How many of your students have you discussed informally with the resource teacher? _____
9. How many of your students have been referred to the resource teacher by other teachers? _____ don't know _____

PART TWO

The following questions refer to the ways in which a resource teacher may provide service to teachers. Please answer these questions as they pertain to your school resource program THIS YEAR.

10. The following descriptions outline a variety of ways resource teachers can provide service. Although none of these descriptions may apply exactly to your experience, please choose the description that best portrays the resource program in your school. CHECK ONE ONLY.
- A. Students see the resource teacher individually or in small groups in the resource room for remedial instruction in basic skills for a definite time period (eg. 30 min.). The rest of the day is spent in a regular class. Little, or no discussion occurs about our programs.
 - B. Students see the resource teacher for remedial instruction for a specified time period (as in response A). Informal discussion of our program occurs on an on-going basis.
 - C. Students see the resource teacher for remedial instruction on a regular basis. In addition, the classroom and resource teachers meet to discuss their programs and to develop a written educational plan that outlines the classroom and resource programs.
 - D. Students see the resource teacher for diagnostic testing/teaching for a specified time period. The resource teacher observes the student in the classroom. The classroom teacher and the resource teacher collaborate to develop a classroom program (written educational plan) that best meets the needs of the student and the teacher.
 - E. Similar to D (above) except that the resource teacher teaches the student a learning strategy to enable the student to handle the regular program. We meet to plan and implement the use of the strategy in my classroom.

11. Briefly describe to the best of your knowledge, the steps your resource teacher follows when she receives a new referral.

The following questions apply to the consultation process and the development of educational plans. Answer these questions as they pertain to your LAST contact with a resource teacher. CHECK ONLY ONE RESPONSE.

12. When the initial referral conference was held:

_____ the resource teacher asked me what I thought the problem was and then added some of her own ideas.

_____ the resource teacher asked me what I thought the problem was.

_____ the resource teacher told me what she thought the problem was.

_____ the problem had already been defined by others (principal, ESS, previous teachers, etc.) and therefore no conference was held.

Comments: _____

13. During the initial planning stage, who decided on the method of diagnosis (ie. - testing and/or observation, data collection)?

_____The resource teacher made the decisions.

_____The principal made the decisions.

_____The classroom teacher made the decisions.

_____The resource teacher and the classroom teacher made the decisions.

_____Other.

Comments: _____

14. Who gathered the diagnostic information on the student?

_____The resource teacher did.

_____The classroom teacher did.

_____Other parties (eg. E.S.S. clinicians) did.

_____The resource and classroom teachers did.

_____All of the above (resource, classroom and E.S.S. clinicians) did.

Comments: _____

15. After the information had been gathered and a plan was being developed based on this information, how was the plan finally developed?

_____ The resource teacher made suggestions and I (the classroom teacher) used these suggestions to develop the plan.

_____ The resource teacher developed a plan and I approved or disapproved of it.

_____ We both developed the plan through negotiation and discussion.

_____ The resource teacher and I each developed plans and the principal used this information to develop a plan.

_____ The student developed the plan along with his/her parents, the resource teacher, principal and me.

Comments: _____

16. During this planning stage:

_____ conflict occurred but was not discussed or resolved.

_____ no conflict or disagreement occurred.

_____ conflict and disagreement openly occurred and was not resolved.

_____ conflict and disagreement openly occurred became a matter of discussion, and was resolved.

Comments: _____

17. During this planning stage:

communication was open and two-way.

communication was limited and initiated by me.

communication was limited and initiated by the resource teacher.

there was no communication.

Comments: _____

18. When the plan was implemented:

I specified the procedures for the resource teacher to implement.

the resource teacher planned and implemented the program.

our responsibilities were determined by discussion and agreement and were designed to suit our individual strengths and roles.

the program had already been planned by previous teachers and/or learning centre or ESS personnel and was implemented as planned.

Comments: _____

19. The plan was evaluated:

___as specified in the plan and by the resource teacher and me.

___by the resource teacher. She provided me with feedback on an ongoing basis.

___by me. I let the resource teacher know if there was any problem.

___by no one. We left it open for discussion, but none was necessary.

Comments: _____

PART THREE

The following questions refer to your school (administration and teachers) in general. Please choose the response that best indicates what happens in your school MOST of the time.

- | | | | | | |
|---------------|---|---|---|---|--------------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Almost always | | | | | Almost never |
20. My school enjoys implementing new programs.
- | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
21. My school highly values professional development.
- | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
22. The staff at my school develops new programs.
- | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
23. New programs are developed outside the school.
- | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
24. When a new program is to be implemented, teachers are encouraged to find new ways to implement the program in their classroom.
- | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
25. Divisional coordinators assist the staff of my school on an on-going basis.
- | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
26. When a new program is to be implemented at my school, the stages of implementation are carefully planned.
- | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|

Almost always 1 2 3 4 5
Almost never

27. The staff at my school make action plans or goal statements every year.

1 2 3 4 5

28. There are incentives for the school staff to implement new programs.

1 2 3 4 5

29. The school staff encourages each other to implement new programs on an on-going basis.

1 2 3 4 5

30. The school staff is given adequate time to implement new programs.

1 2 3 4 5

31. Is it important to implement all parts of a new program in your school.

1 2 3 4 5

32. When new programs are implemented, adequate inservicing is given.

1 2 3 4 5

33. When new programs are implemented, planning time is given.

1 2 3 4 5

34. When new programs are implemented, new materials are provided if needed.

1 2 3 4 5

Almost always 1 2 3 4 5
Almost never

35. When new programs are implemented, I make use of all available resources (people, time, material).

1 2 3 4 5

36. What are the three most important programs in your school? (eg. whole language approach to instruction, phys. ed. co-curricular activities, mainstreaming/resource, effective instructional techniques, etc.)

Strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5
Strongly disagree

50. The goal of the resource teacher should be to work with me to identify the problem, to plan and to carry out recommendations.

1 2 3 4 5

51. The goal of the resource teacher should be to plan and to carry out recommendations after I have identified the problem.

1 2 3 4 5

52. The goal of the resource teacher should be to identify the problem and develop recommendations which I will then carry out.

1 2 3 4 5

53. The goal of the resource teacher should be to help me solve the problem by clarifying my perceptions of it.

1 2 3 4 5

PART FIVE

The following items refer to consultation processes. Please assess the importance of the following resource teacher characteristics to the success of the consultation process.

	1	2	3	4	5
Very important					Not at all

In your experience, how important to the success of the consultation process is it that:

54. you find it comfortable to speak to the resource teacher.

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

55. the resource teacher is a good listener.

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

56. the resource teacher understands your particular situation.

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

57. the resource teacher is flexible and changes her ideas and/or plans to meet the needs of the situation.

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

58. the resource teacher makes you feel like a competent professional with good ideas.

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

Very important 1 2 3 4 5
Not at all

68. the resource teacher handles conflict well.

1 2 3 4 5

Other comments:

APPENDIX D

THE PANEL REACTION

6. The questionnaire is attempting to determine the consultation approach in use and some of the conditions that may have shaped this approach. Are there any questions that you feel should have been raised and were not?

7. Comments:

APPENDIX E

THE LETTERS

Box 22, Group 35, R.R.1
Headingley, Manitoba
ROH OJO
March 27, 1988

H.E. May, Ph.D.
Chair
Ethics Review Committee
Graduate Studies Office
Faculty of Education
The University of Manitoba
Winnipeg, Manitoba
R3T 2N2

Dear Dr. May:

I would like to resubmit my research proposal entitled *Study of Collaborative Consultation As A Model of Resource Teacher Service Delivery* for the consideration of the Ethics Review Committee. I have revised the questionnaire and the administrator interview schedule to accommodate the concerns of the Ethics Review Committee.

This study has been approved by the Superintendent of the school division involved in this research and has the full support of the resource teachers involved. I have discussed this study with the resource teachers and each resource teacher in the study has a copy of the questionnaire. The resource teachers are very interested in this study and have offered to support it in their schools. They have also requested feedback and I will present the results to them in the Fall of 1988.

I hope that the study, in its revised form, will be acceptable to the Ethics Review Committee and I thank you for the opportunity to resubmit this proposal.

Sincerely,

Donna L. Miller

cc. Dr. J.A. Riffel

Box 22, Group 35, R.R.1
Headingley, Manitoba
R0H 0J0
May 11,1988

Mr. Jones
Superintendent of Secondary Schools
200 Main Street
Anywhere, Canada

Dear Mr. Jones:

Enclosed please find the final copy of The Consultative Resource Program Survey that was developed for my research thesis. This questionnaire was again revised to satisfy the University of Manitoba Ethics Committee. I am sure that you will be satisfied with their recommendations as the questionnaire now includes more of your suggestions . The study has been approved by the Ethics Committee and I have completed an oral defence of this thesis proposal.

I am proceeding with the research and will have distributed the questionnaires to the schools in the study by May 13. A summary of the research findings will be sent to you in the Fall of 1988. Thank-you very much for your support and assistance.

Sincerely,

Donna L. Miller

May 11, 1988

Dear Building Administrator:

Mainstreaming of special students creates new expectations for classroom and resource teachers. There is a growing need to better understand how effectively the resource program is operating and how to improve the consultation process. To this end, I am undertaking a study to document current practices and perceptions of the resource program in our school division for my M.Ed. thesis. It is anticipated that this study will generate useful information for the improvement of resource programs.

As part of this study I am soliciting your assistance and ask that you or your resource teacher explain this study to your staff and solicit their support. If you have any questions please contact me at my school.

Individual responses and schools will remain anonymous and confidential and a summary of the research will be disseminated to all teachers on request.

Your assistance and support is appreciated.

Sincerely,

Donna L. Miller
Resource Teacher
My School

May 11, 1988

Dear Colleague:

Mainstreaming of students creates new expectations for classroom and resource teachers. There is a growing need to better understand how the resource program is operating and how to improve the consultation process. To this end, I am undertaking a study to document current practices and perceptions of the resource program in our school division for my M.Ed. thesis. It is anticipated that this study will generate useful information for the improvement of resource programs and practices.

As part of this study, I am soliciting your assistance and ask that you complete and return the attached questionnaire. Your participation in this study is voluntary. The questionnaire will only take about thirty minutes of your time. Completed questionnaires may be returned to me through the divisional courier.

Individual responses and schools will remain anonymous and confidential and a summary of the research will be disseminated to all teachers on request.

If you have any questions, your school resource teacher may be able to assist you, or, you may call me at my school. Your assistance in responding is appreciated.

Sincerely,

Donna L. Miller
Resource Teacher
My School

June 1, 1988

Dear Colleague,

In mid May I distributed a questionnaire to all junior high teachers on the consultative resource program presently used in our division. This survey is a very important part of a study of our division's resource program that I am undertaking for my M.Ed. thesis. If you have completed and returned the survey, I thank you very much for your support. I understand how busy this time of year is for teachers and I appreciate your cooperation.

If you have not completed this survey, I urge you to do so. For this study to be reliable and useful it is important that as many teachers as possible participate. Your opinions and suggestions are important. Please take a few minutes and respond. Your responses will remain anonymous and confidential and I would be pleased to share the results of the study with you. If you have misplaced your questionnaire, your school resource teacher has additional copies. Your assistance in responding is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Donna L. Miller
Resource Teacher
My School

APPENDIX F

GLOSSARY

Definition of Terms

The following definitions of terms used in the presentation and discussion of the data are provided to assist the reader.

Bottom up refers to a management style that involves the use of the workers in determining the impetus and development of change implementation plans.

Co-curricular programs refer to optional programs chosen by students and offered outside of school hours. They may include sports activities, jazz band, drama club, etc.

Clinicians are divisional personnel who provide expertise in specific areas. Children are referred to these clinicians by the resource teacher or counsellor and these personnel are used as a resource to the referring party, the classroom teachers and the school. The clinicians used by the schools in the study are primarily psychologists, social workers and speech/language pathologists.

Collaboration is the act of working with or cooperating with others to jointly solve problems.

Collaborative consultation is the act of consulting where the consultant enters the relationship with the consultee with the notion that issues can only be dealt with effectively by joining his specialized knowledge with the consultee's knowledge of the organization (classroom, content area, etc.). The consultant applies their special skills to help the consultee solve problems. Responsibility is shared. Decision making is bilateral. Data collection and analysis are joint efforts. Control issues become matters for discussion and negotiation. Communication is two-way. Implementation responsibilities are determined by discussion and agreement. The consultant's role is to solve problems so that they stay solved (Block,1981).

Collaborative-consultative resource programs are programs where the resource teacher acts as an in-school consultant to classroom teachers and provides this consultative service in a collaborative fashion.

Consultation refers to the act of consulting or the giving of professional services or advice. Consultants may provide this service in many ways, one of which is by the use of collaboration.

Consultation time refers to the time given to a consultant to consult. In this study it specifically refers to time allocated to the resource and classroom teachers to consult during regular school hours.

Critical Thinking programs are separate programs conducted within the school day, the purpose of which, is to improve the skill of thinking critically. The school division in the study was using Philosophy for Children at the time of the study.

Cumulative file refers to a folder containing information on student progress that follows the student throughout his school career and is kept in the school general office for access by teachers and parents.

Diagnostic-Collaborative (DC) Resource Model refers to the specific collaborative-consultative resource teacher model in use in the school division studied. It is described in the school division policy and is included in Appendix E.

Diagnostic teaching refers to a short term process of testing hypotheses made during diagnostic testing. Classroom materials and remedial materials are used on a trial basis to develop a plan for the student. This is also the phase where the plan ideas are tested to see if they are effective.

Diagnostic testing refers to the use of formal and informal tests with a referred student to develop an idea of the students level of functioning, his strengths and weaknesses and hypotheses to be tested during diagnostic teaching.

Direct service refers to the individual teaching of identified students on a regular basis over an extended time period by the resource teacher. It is to be contrasted with indirect service which refers to the use of consultation by the resource teacher and with diagnostic teaching which refers to a short term process of hypothesis testing. Indirect and direct service may occur simultaneously.

Educational plan refers to a written plan of action developed by the resource and classroom teachers for a referred student and to be implemented by the resource and classroom teachers. Roles and responsibilities are specifically outlined. The plan is

signed by participating parties and the school principal and is kept in the student's resource file.

Educational planning conference is the meeting of resource and classroom teachers to develop the educational plan.

Evaluation refers to the process outlined in the educational plan for determining if the plan is working. It is the final phase of the collaborative-consultative resource program.

External consultant refers to consultants available to school personnel from outside the school itself. It excludes resource teachers, guidance counsellors and clinicians but includes divisional coordinators/consultants and Department of Education consultants.

Follow-up refers to the act of checking the progress of implementation of an educational plan.

Formal consultation refers to a consultative process that follows formal stages of service delivery such as those outlined in the divisional policy.

Formal testing refers to the use of testing instruments that have been published and norm referenced.

Gifted program refers to the mainstreamed program for students identified as gifted used in the school division in the study. It involves some pull-out programming planned by a teacher of the gifted but is not a segregated program at varying grade levels nor does it involve the entire day. It is to be contrasted with the segregated program implemented at Dr. Darrell Junior High School.

Implementation refers to the action of putting an educational plan into practice.

Indirect service refers to consultative service to teachers and thus indirect service to the student. It is to be contrasted with direct service which refers to individual instructional service to the student. Indirect and direct service may occur simultaneously.

Individualized program refers to a program developed for an individual student that may be offered in the regular classroom and/or the resource room. It may be a modified classroom program or a separate classroom or remedial program.

Informal consultation refers to the use of consultation on an informal basis that does not follow an outlined set of stages such as those in the divisional policy in Appendix E. It may involve a particular student or a class as a whole and usually involves the brainstorming of ideas. It does not involve the preparation of an educational plan.

Informal testing involves the use of teacher prepared testing instruments that are not published or the use of published tests that are not norm referenced such as an informal reading inventory or a developmental checklist. It may also involve the structured use of classroom materials.

High Incidence refers to students with learning difficulties in the general school population whose disabilities are of a high incidence. It is assumed that these students can be appropriately served within the classroom with the help of a consultative resource teacher who will assist the classroom teacher with program modifications.

Internal consultant is a consultant within the school such as the collaborative-consultative resource teacher.

Low Incidence refers to students with learning difficulties in the general school population whose disabilities are of a low incidence. It is assumed that these students will require supports above and beyond those provided by a consultative resource teacher and that classroom programs will require severe modifications. Funding for these supports is provided by the Department of Education who also reviews the individual student programs. The amount of funding provided is determined by the student's needs and by the category of student. Students must be tested and labelled in order for funding to be granted. Three categories of Low Incidence funding exist. Level One indicates the least severe disability and Level Three indicates the most severe disability. At the time of the study, this funding was still in existence but changes had been proposed that were to be implemented the following school year. These changes involved the deletion of individual applications for Level One funding and the inclusion of this funding as a block in the High Incidence

block grant to school divisions. Level Two and Level Three procedures were to remain the same.

Modified program refers to a classroom program that has been changed in some way to accommodate the needs of students encountering difficulty. It may be changed in a minor way for all students or in a major way for a specific student. In the school division studied, major modifications must be documented in an educational plan and must involve the expertise of the resource teacher.

Paraprofessional refers to a non-professional person hired to provide assistance to low incidence students. In the school division studied, paraprofessionals were hired for Level Two and Three students only.

Problem solving strategy refers to a planned procedure followed by teachers in a school to solve professional problems. It refers to a strategy known and accepted by all school employees.

Referral conference refers to a formal meeting of the classroom and resource teachers to discuss a teacher referral and to plan action to be taken.

Resistance refers to the behavior of teachers that serves to block the acceptance and implementation of change. It specifically refers to this behavior in relation to the implementation of individual educational plans and program modifications.

Resources refers to the materials, strategies and time necessary to the implementation of change.

Resource program refers to the specific special education program for mainstreamed students with learning difficulties followed by a resource teacher. It may involve the use of a segregated resource room program or a consultative program such as the diagnostic-prescriptive or collaborative-consultative programs.

Resource Teacher refers to the teacher conducting the resource program.

Slow learner refers to a student with below average intelligence and low achievement test scores who has not been labelled mentally handicapped. The school division in the study offered additional staffing units for students identified as slow learners through the use of group intelligence and achievement tests. Principals were to provide mainstreamed programs for these students. There was no formal guideline for

these programs. Some principals used the staffing units to provide more resource teacher service; others provided individual classroom teacher service.

Teacher tutorial service refers to the tutoring of individual students or small groups of students in classroom content by classroom teachers during designated periods of time during the school day. This service was sometimes provided in consultation with the resource teacher.

Top down refers to a management style indicated by the planning of program changes by the administration.

Tutorial service refers to the direct instruction of students in small groups or individually by resource or classroom teachers.

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

- Abidin, R. R. (1975). Effects of Behavioral Consultation. Journal of School Psychology, 13 (1), 51-56.
- Adamson, R. (1983). Linking two worlds: Serving resource students at the secondary level. Teaching Exceptional Children, Winter, 70-76.
- Algozzine, B., Christenson, S., and Ysseldyke, J. E. (1982). Probabilities associated with the referral to placement process. Teacher Education and Special Education, 5 (3), 19-23.
- Algozzine, B., Ysseldyke, J. E., and Christenson, S. (1983). An analysis of the incidence of special class placement: The masses are burgeoning. Journal of Special Education, 17, 141-147.
- Alpert, Judith L. (1982). Psychological consultation in educational settings. San Francisco: Jossey-Mass Publishers.
- Anderson-Inman, L. (1981). Transenvironmental programming: Promoting success in the regular class by maximizing the effect of resource instruction. Special Education Technology, 4 (4), 3-12.
- Apter, Steven J. (1982). Troubled children/troubled systems. New York: Pergamon Press.
- Bauer, H. (1975). The resource teacher - a teacher consultant. Academic Therapy, X (3), 299-304.
- Benjamin, A. (1981). The helping interview. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Bergman, J. R. and Neumann II, A. J. (1980). The identification on resources and constraints influencing plan design in consultation. The Journal of School Psychology, 18 (4), 317-323.
- Bickel, W. and Bickel, D. (1986). Effective schools, classrooms and instruction: Implications for special education. Exceptional Children, 52 (6), 489-500.
- Block, P. (1981). Flawless consulting a guide to getting your expertise used. Austin: Learning Concepts.
- Boud and McDonald (1981). Educational development through consultancy. Guilford, Surrey: Society for Research into Higher Education.
- Bravi, G. (1978). Diagnostic-prescriptive teaching. An unpublished paper. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba.
- Brokes, A. (1975). A process model of consultation. In C. Parker (ed.). Psychological consultation: Helping teachers meet special needs, 185-203. Reston, Va: Council for Exceptional Children.
- Cenerini, N. (1980). Special Education in Manitoba Resource Teacher Program. Special Education in Canada Issues and Concerns for the '80s, 69-75.
- Chale, Leslie A. (1979). The Resource Teacher's Role and the Implementation of Diagnostic Reading Module. M. Ed. thesis, University of Manitoba.
- Chalfont, James C. (1985). Identifying learning disabled students: A summary of the national task force report. Learning Disabilities Focus, 1, 9-20.
- Cipani, E. (1985). The three phases of behavioral consultation: Objectives, intervention, and quality assurance. Teacher Education and Special Education, 8, 144-152.

- Conoley, J. C. (ed). (1981). Consultation in schools: Theory, research, procedures. New York: Academic Press.
- Conoley, J. C. and Conoley, C. S. (1982). School consultation: A guide to practice and training. New York, N.Y.: Pergamon Press, Inc.
- Converse, J. M. and Pressu, S. (1986). Survey questions handcrafting the standard questionnaire. London: Sage Publications.
- Corbett, Dickson, H., Dawson, Judith A., Firestone, William A. (1984). School context and school change. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Cox, Pat L. (1983). Complementary roles in successful change. Educational Leadership, November, 10-13.
- Crandall, David P. (1983). The teacher's role in school improvement. Educational Leadership, November, 6-9.
- Darch, C. and Carmine, D. (1986). Teaching content area material to learning disabled students. Exceptional Children, 53, 240-246.
- Deno, E. (ed.). (1972). Instructional alternatives for exceptional children. Reston, Va: The Council for Exceptional Children.
- Deno, E. (1970). Special education as developmental capital. Exceptional Children, 37, 229-237.
- Deshler, D., Alley, G., Warner, M. and Schumaker, J. (1981). Instructional practices for promoting skill acquisition and generalization in severely learning disabled adolescents. Learning Disability Quarterly, (4), 415-421.
- Deshler, D., Lourey, N. and Alley, G. (1970). Programming alternatives for LD adolescents: A nationwide survey. Academic Therapy, 14 (4), 389-397.
- Edwards, S. (1981). Changing teacher practice: A synthesis of relevant research. Document Reproduction Service. (Eric No. ED223566). Austin: Texas University.
- Evans, S. (1980). The consultant role of the resource teacher. Exceptional Children, 46 (5), 402-403.
- Fox, W., Egner, A., Paolucci, P., Perleman, P. and McKenzie, H. (1973). An introduction to a regular classroom approach to special education. In E. Deno (ed.). Instructional alternatives for exceptional children. Reston, Va: The Council for Exceptional Children.
- Friend, M. (1984). Consulting skills for resource teachers. Learning Disability Quarterly, 7, 246-250.
- Friend, Marilyn. (1980). Resource teachers and consultation: Practical considerations. Presentation of CEC's 62 Annual Convention, Washington, D.C.
- Friend, M. (1985). Training special educators to be consultants: considerations for developing programs. Teacher education and Special Education, 8, 115-120.
- Gallagher, P. (1985). Inservice! A mandated special education course and its effects on classroom teachers. Teacher Education and Special Education, 8, 115-120.

- Gallessich, J. (1982). The profession and practice of consultation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Gartner, A. (1986). Disabling help: Special education at the crossroads. Exceptional Children, 53 (1), 72-76.
- Gay, L. R. (1981). Educational research. Columbus: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co.
- Graden, Janet L., Casey, Ann, Christenson, Sandra L. (1985). Implementing a prereferral intervention system: Part II. the data. Exceptional Children, 51 (6), 487-496.
- Graham, S., Burdg, N., Hudson, F., Carpenter, D. (1980). Educational personnel's perceptions of mainstreaming and resource room effectiveness. Psychology in the Schools, 17 (1), 128-134.
- Haight, Sherrel Lee. (1984). Special education teacher consultant: Idealism versus realism. Exceptional Children, 50 (6), 507-514.
- Hart, Leslie A. (1989). The Horse is Dead. Kappan, November, 237-242.
- Hasazi. (1976). The consultant teacher. In J. B. Jordan (ed.). Teacher, please don't close the door. Reston, Va: The Council for Exceptional Children, 59-60.
- Huefner, Dixie Snow. (1988). The Consulting Teacher Model: Risks and Opportunities. Exceptional Children, 54.(5), 403-414.
- Huberman, A. M. (1973). Understanding change in education: An introduction. Paris: United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization.
- Huberman, Michael A. (1983). School improvement strategies that work: Some scenarios, Educational Leadership, November, 23-27.
- Idol-Maestas, L. (1983). Special educator's consultation handbook. Rockville Md: Aspen.
- Idol-Maestas, L., Lloyd, S., and Lilly, M. (1981). Implementation of a non-categorical approach to direct service and teacher education. Exceptional Children, 48, 213-219.
- Idol-Maestas, L. and Ritter, S. (1985). A follow-up study of resource/consulting teachers: Factors that facilitate and inhibit teacher consultation. Teacher Education and Special Education, 8, 121-131.
- Idol-Maestas, L., Nevin, A., and Paolucci-Whitcomb, P. (1984). Facilitator's manual for collaborative consultation: Principles and techniques. Reston, Va: The Council for Exceptional Children.
- Kee, Y. T. (1980). Aspects of managing. Winnipeg, Manitoba: Sparrowhawk Press.
- Keppel, G. and Saufley, W. (1980). Introduction to design and analysis. New York: W. H. Freeman and Co.
- Kirk, Samuel A. (1986). Redesigning delivery systems for learning disabled students. Learning Disabilities Focus, 1 (1), 4-6.
- Knight, M., Herman, W. M., Paolucci-Whitcomb, P., Hasazi, S. E. and Nevin, A. (1981). A four-year evaluation of consulting teacher service. Behavioral Disorders, 6 (2), 92-100.
- Lilly, S. M. (1987). Lack of focus on special education in literature on educational reform. Exceptional Children, 53 (4), 325-326.

- Lilly, S. M. (1970). Special education: A teapot in a tempest. Exceptional Children, 43-49.
- Lilly, S. M., and Givens-Ogle, L. B. (1981). Teacher consultation: Present, past and future. Behavioral Disorders, 6 (2), 73-77.
- Lippitt, G., and Lippitt, R. (1986). The consulting process in action. San Diego, Ca: University Associates, Inc.
- Loucks, Susan F. (1983). At last: Some good news from a study of school improvement. Educational Leadership, November, 4-5.
- Madden, N., and Slavin, R. (1983). Mainstreaming students with mild handicaps: Academic achievement and social outcomes. Review of Educational Research, 53, 519-569.
- Mainstreaming Reactions and Concerns. In A Report to the Manitoba Teachers' Society 1985 Annual General Meeting, by the Manitoba Teachers' Society. Winnipeg: Manitoba Teachers' Society, 1985.
- McDonald, Joseph P. (1989). When Outsiders Try to Change Schools From the Inside. Kappan, November, 206-212.
- McLoughlin, J. A., and Kelly, D. (1982). Issues facing the resource teacher. Learning Disability Quarterly, 5, Winter, 58-63.
- Medway, F. J. (1979). How effective is school consultation? A review of recent research. Journal of School Psychology, 17 (3), 275-282.
- Miller, T. L. and Sabatino, D. A. (1978). An evaluation of the teacher consultant model as an approach to mainstreaming. Exceptional Children, 45, 86-91.
- Mishel, W. (1968). Personality and assessment. New York: Wiley and Sons.
- Morgan, D. P. and Rhode, G. (1983). Teachers' attitudes toward IEP's: A two year follow-up. Exceptional Children, 50 (1), 64-67.
- Paolucci-Whitcomb, P. and Nevin, A. (1985). Preparing consulting teachers through a collaborative approach between university faculty and field-based consulting teachers. Teacher Education and Special Education, 8, 132-143.
- Parish, R. and Aquila, Frank D. (1983). Comments on the school improvement study: The whole is more than the sum of the parts. Educational Leadership, November, 34-36.
- Powell, G. and Posner, B. z. (1978). Resistance to change reconsidered: Implications for managers. Human Resource Management, 17, 29-34.
- Pergach, M. and Sapon-Shevin, M. (1987). New agendas for special education policy: What the national reports haven't said. Exceptional Children, 53, (4), 295-299.
- Prouty, R. (1970). diagnostic teaching: a modest proposal. Elementary School Journal, 70, 265-270.
- Reisberg, L. and Wolf, R. (1986). Developing a consulting program in special education: Implementation and interventions. Focus on Exceptional Children, 19 (3), 1-15.

- Reger, R. and Koppman, M. (1971). The Child Oriented Resource Room. Exceptional Children, 37, 460-464.
- Reynolds, M. C., Wang, M. C. and Walberg, H. J. (1987). The necessary restructuring of special and regular education. Exceptional Children, 53 (5), 391-398.
- Robinson, E. H. and Brosh, M. C. (1980). Communication skills training for resource teachers. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 13 (3), 55-58.
- Rosenfield, S. and Rubinson, F. (1985). Introducing curriculum-based assessment through consultation. Exceptional Children, 52 (3), 282-287.
- Sabatino, D. A. (1972). Resource rooms: The renaissance in special education. The Journal of Special Education, 6 (4), 335-346.
- Sarason, Seymour B. (1983) Schooling in America: Scapegoat and Salvation. New York: The Free Press.
- Sarason, Seymour B. (1971) The Culture of the School and the Problem of Change. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.
- Schein, E. H. (1969). Process consultation: Its role in organization development. Reading, Ma: Addison Wesley.
- Schumaker, Jean B., Deshler, Donald D., Alley, Gordon R., Warner, Michael M. (1983). Toward the development of an intervention model for learning disabled adolescents: The University of Kansas Institute. Exceptional Education Quarterly, 4 (1), 45-74.
- Shepard, L. A. (1987). The new push for excellence: Widening the schism between regular and special education. Exceptional Children, 53 (4), 327-329.
- Sleeter, C. E. (1986). Learning disabilities: The social construction of a special education category. Exceptional Children, 53 (1), 46-54.
- Special Education in Manitoba. In Policy and Procedural Guidelines for the Education of Students with Special Needs in the Public School System. Winnipeg: Manitoba Education and Training, August, 1989.
- Speece, D. L. and Mandell, C. J. (1980). Resource room support services for regular teachers. Learning Disability Quarterly, 3, 49-53.
- Spodek, Bernard. (1982). What special educators need to know about regular classrooms. The Educational Forum, 46 (3), 295-307.
- Stainback, W. and Stainback, S. (1984). A rationale for the merger of special and regular education. Exceptional Children, 51 (2), 102-111.
- Stainback, W., Stainback, S., Courtage, L. and Jaben, T. (1985). Facilitating mainstreaming by modifying the mainstream. Exceptional Children, 52 (2), 144-152.
- Stephan, Hugo H. 1976. The Resource Teacher Program: Implementation and Evaluation. M. Ed. thesis, University of Manitoba.

- Tharpe, R. (1975). The triadic model of consultation. In C. Parker (ed.). Psychological consultation in the schools: Helping teachers meet special needs. Reston, Va: The Council for Exceptional Children.
- Thurlow, M. L., Ysseldyke, J. E. (1982). Instructional planning: Information collected by school psychologists vs information considered useful by teachers. Journal of School Psychology, 20, 3-10.
- Tombari, M. L. and Bergen, J. R. (1978). Consultant cues and teacher verbalizations, judgements, and expectancies concerning children's adjustment problems. Journal of School Psychology, 16 (3), 212-219.
- Wang, M. C. and Birch, J. W. (1984). Comparisons of a full-time mainstreaming program and a resource room approach. Exceptional Children, 51 (1), 33-40.
- Wang, M. C. and Birch, J. W. (1984). Effective special education in regular classes. Exceptional Children, February, 391-397.
- Wang, M. C. and Reynolds, M. C. (1986). "Catch 22 and disabling help": A reply to Alan Gartner. Exceptional Children, 53 (1), 77-78.
- West, F. J. and Cannon, G. S. (1987). Essential collaborative competencies for regular and special educators. Technical Report No. 103. Austin, Texas: University of Texas at Austin.
- West, F. J. (1985). Regular and special educators' preferences for school-based consultation models: A statewide study. Technical Report No. 101, Austin, Texas: University of Texas at Austin.
- Will, M. C. (1986). Educating children with learning problems: A shared responsibility. Exceptional Children, February, 411-415.
- Ysseldyke, J. E., Algozzine, B., Shinn, M., McGue, M. (1982). Similarities and differences between underachievers and students classified learning disabled. Journal of Special Education, 16, 73-85.
- Ysseldyke, J. E., Thurlow, M., Graden, J., Wesson, C., Algozzine, B., Deno, S. (1983). Generalizations from five years of research on assessment and decision making: The University of Minnesota Institute. Exceptional Education Quarterly, 4, 75-93.